

# Concordia Theological Monthly

---

---

Vol. XVII

SEPTEMBER, 1946

No. 9

---

---

## The Hades Gospel and the Apocatastasis Gospel

By TH. ENGELDER

The Hades gospel proclaims that some men will get another chance for conversion in yonder life. The apocatastasis gospel proclaims that all inmates of hell, including the fallen angels, will finally be saved.

*The Universalist Profession of Belief*, adopted at Winchester 1803, declares: "1. We believe that the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments contain a revelation of the character of God and of the duty, interest and final destination of mankind. 2. We believe that there is one God, whose nature is love, revealed in one Lord Jesus Christ, by one Holy Spirit of grace, who will finally restore the whole family of mankind to holiness and happiness. 3. . . ." "This statement of belief in the ultimate success of the divine administration, the final holiness and sanctification of all souls . . . was made known and declared to all the world as an Evangel in the articles of 1803. . . . 'Hail,' then, we say to the men of Winchester, these preachers of an Unlimited Gospel. To save the glory and honor of God we must believe in the salvation of all his children. . . . About one hundred and fifty years ago men began to think and act whose hearts were intuitive of the love of an All-Father, and as they advanced in thought and fervor of soul, they could not but proclaim a gospel of gladdest news. . . . Nearly all the superstitions have gone at one blow. The devil troops to an infernal jail. The fires of hell are extinguished. A substitutional sacrifice disappears.

God is not to be propitiated, but served and loved and enjoyed." (*The Winchester Centennial*, 1803—1903, pp. 21, 38, 50, 60, 154.) "Let those who impugn the Gospel of Eternal Hope remember that it was openly preached by the 'Father of Fathers'—Gregory of Nyssa—whose writings were referred to by the Council of Ephesus as the great bulwark of the Church against heresy. . . . He taught that the soul, having an affinity to God, must ultimately return to God." (F. W. Farrar, *Eternal Hope*, pp. 159, 161.)

This Evangel, "the gospel of gladdest news," has found many heralds. "Not only speculative theologians, such as Origen and Schleiermacher, but also Bible theologians, Zinzendorf, Bengel, Blumhardt, preached it." (A. Koeberle, *Das Evangelium und die Raetsel der Geschichte*, p. 72.) The list includes Gregory Nazianzen, J. Scotus Erigena, the Anabaptists Denk and Hetzer, the Schleiermacherians Nitsch, Schweizer, etc., Archbishop Tillotson, Charles Kingsley, John Foster, the pietistic mystic J. W. Petersen, the Berleburger Bibel, C. F. Oetinger (theosophist), etc., etc. (See Th. Traub, *Von den Letzten Dingen*, p. 272. W. Rohnert, *Die Dogmatik der Ev.-Luth. Kirche*, p. 620. Meusel, *Kirchl. Handlexikon*, s. v. *Wiederbringung Aller Dinge*, Schaff-Herzog Encycp. of Rel. Kn., s. v. Punishment, Future, etc.) Other Origenists will be mentioned later. "The new light has been gaining ground steadily for a hundred years. . . . We venture the prediction that by the end of another hundred years the idea of an endless punishment in any form, medieval or modern, will be obsolete among all Protestant churches. . . . The Universal Fatherhood of God is now proclaimed from the housetops of Orthodoxy, and while many of the clear-sighted recognize this as logically involving Universalism, it is accepted nevertheless." Thus *The Winchester Centennial*, pp. 39, 40, 44.

We submit a few typical statements. Charles H. Eaton: "The doctrinal teaching of the Universalist Church is (1) The universal fatherhood and the universal brotherhood revealed in a universal Savior. . . . (4) The certainty of punishment, having for its object the final recovery of all men. . . . (8) The reunion of all in the everlasting life. . . . When God was represented as an infinite demon, gluttoning himself with the agonies of the damned, burning forever in flames of fire and brimstone, the Universalists said such views of God are blas-

phemous. God is an infinite Father." (*Why I Am What I Am*, pp. 71, 75.) Dr. S. Shepard: "We (the Universalists) believe that this is a universe of absolute justice, and that every soul will meet with justice, working out its problems until in some way it comes to a stage of high development and harmony with God." (See J. A. Weber, *Religions and Philosophies*, p. 198.) The Unitarians have stated their creed thus: "There is a general consensus upon the unipersonality of God, the strict humanity of Jesus, the essential dignity and perfectibility of human nature, the natural character of the Bible, and the hope for the ultimate salvation of all souls, in distinction from the views traditionally taught on these points."<sup>1</sup> Theodore Parker, while he acknowledged that the doctrine of eternal punishment was taught in the New Testament, rejected it and came at last to say of the whole theology which includes this idea of endless punishment that it "sneers at common sense, spits upon reason, and makes God a devil." (See A. H. Strong, *Systematic Theology*, p. 599.) *The Bible Champion*, Oct., 1922, p. 386, quotes a Unitarian writer thus: "Heaven and earth and stars in their infinite number, all worlds that roll through the great Creator's space, would raise one universal shout of horror at the endless punishment of sinners. . . . An eternal hell would make the God inflicting it more reprobate and more deserving of such pangs than any human being, though we should imagine one uniting in himself the crimes of all the Caesars and the Borgias, the Hapsburgs and the Bourbons, the Sultans and the Tsars." Dr. Charles W. Eliot, President of Harvard: "The religion of the future will reject all the old teachings concerning rewards and eternal punishments. In particular, the new religion will not believe in a hell, where God punishes sin eternally. The God of the future will be a God of mercy and of goodness and of grace." (See *Lutheraner*, 1924, p. 424.)

Bishop Ewing of Argyll and the Isles: "Unless this (apocatastasis) be held as a matter of faith and not as a speculative dogma, it is practically valueless. With me this final victory is not a matter of speculation at all, but of positive faith; and to disbelieve it would be for me to cease altogether either to

<sup>1</sup> It has been said that the Unitarians teach that man is too good to be eternally damned, while the Universalists teach that God is too good to damn man eternally.

trust or to worship God." (See F. W. Farrar, *Eternal Hope*, p. 218.) Harris Franklin Rall: "So far we have talked about the saints and their hope of heaven; but what about the sinners and the Church's teaching as to judgment and hell? . . . We must cast out some unchristian ideas that have remained too long in Christian thought. . . . This world is not so much a place for the testing as for the making of men; that is God's great concern. And why should he be limited to this world? The physical fact of death does not at a stroke change these mixed and unformed lives into pure saints or sinners. If the world to come has place for growth and change, that may mean change of direction. We cannot believe that a Christlike God will ever turn away from men who turn to him, or cease in his effort to win men from death to life." (*A Faith for Today*, p. 258 ff.) "The time was," said Pastor W. H. Burns at a Methodist conference in Detroit on Oct. 31, 1938, "when I was a boy, that I believed that the world was made in six days. I was taught and believed in literal hell fire. But none of us believe these things today. We have made advancement in doctrine and faith." In a sermon preached in Grace Methodist Church, St. Louis, March 22, 1931, Dr. James Crowther declared: "I believe in a Christlike God. Jesus taught us that God is love. . . . Mankind can never reverence, much less love, a God who consigns his offspring to the eternal torments of the damned. Only a theologian could do that, and God is not a theologian, but a father and a friend." Walter Rauschenbusch: "No man, in any human sense of justice, has deserved an eternity of hell." (*A Theology for the Social Gospel*, p. 233.) And the Liberal Catholic Church has this creed: "We believe that God is Love, and Power, and Truth, and Light; that perfect justice rules the world; that all His sons shall one day reach His feet, however far they stray." (See *Popular Symbolics*, p. 208. — "The Liberal Catholic Church encourages among its adherents the freest play of scientific and philosophic thought," says its spokesman in Weber, *op. cit.*, p. 74.) "We affirm," say the Spiritists in their Declaration of Principles, "the moral responsibility of the individual and that he makes his own happiness or unhappiness as he obeys or disobeys nature's psychic laws. We affirm that the doorway to reformation is never closed against any human soul, here or hereafter." (*Census of Rel. Bodies*, 1926. Part II, p. 1319.)



There are those who do not teach restorationism (or the related doctrine of annihilationism) directly, but speak of it as a possibility, and speak of it in a way which indicates that in their heart they believe in it. Vernon F. Storr, Archdeacon of Westminster: "The idea of an eternal fixity of condition, whether for weal or woe, does not appeal to us. . . . Another assumption made by the Universalist is that 'it is never too late to mend.' It may be so. The fate of the hardened sinner must remain an enigma. . . . The Bible throws little light upon the subject." (*Do Dead Men Live Again?* pp. 209, 225.) Sydney Cave: "Our Lord expressed this risk in terms of apocalyptic symbols. These symbols speak of loss that men need much to fear, but from them, in the opinion of most scholars, no theory of eternal punishment can be derived." (*What Shall We Say of Christ?* p. 177.) W. E. Channing (Unitarian): "I have spoken of the pains and penalties of moral evil, or of wrong-doing, in the world to come. How long they will endure, I know not. Whether they will issue in the reformation of happiness of the sufferer, or will terminate in the extinction of his conscious being, is a question on which Scripture throws no clear light." (*Channing's Works*, p. 353.) "Bei den Theologen der Aufklaerung koennen wir eine allmaehlig sich vollziehende Aufloesung der alten Lehre von den ewigen Strafen und damit des Dualismus, der den Gedankengang der Orthodoxie praegte, wahrnehmen. Hier wird von der Moeglichkeit und der *Wahrscheinlichkeit*, dass die Verdammten sich bessern koennen, gesprochen." The rationalists in the period of "enlightenment" spoke of the possibility and probability of the moral improvement of the damned. (G. Aulen, *Das christliche Gottesbild*, p. 300. — Here is a curiosity: "Die Verdammten stehen, wenn sie sich bessern, hinter denen, die von Anfang an selig sind. Eben dadurch aber, dass sie hinter denen stehen, erkennen sie in all Ewigkeit ihre Strafe. . . . Einige Theologen der Aufklaerung, wie Wegscheider, stellen sich vor, dass die Bestraften bei fortgesetzter Besserung den Platz einnehmen koennen, der fruher von Seligen niederer Grade eingenommen war. Wegscheider denkt sich deutlich das Ganze zunaechst als ein ausgebildetes Befoerderungssystem." *Ibid.*) Julius Mueller: "While it may be open to the sinner in the next world, as in this, to turn to God by a free act of will, it is nevertheless true that the tendency of

sin is to perpetuate itself, and therefore that eternal punishment is possible." (Schaff-Herzog, *l. cit.*) *The Lutheran*, May 14, 1941: "Is there a hell? . . . In rejecting the extreme of material hell fire we should not go to the other extreme of explaining away hell itself. . . . In the moral order of a loving God, however, we have the hope that final mercy will prevail. Retribution may give way to reformation; justice to mercy. Divine Love, we like to believe, will triumph in eternity. Humanity's case is in the hands of the all-wise, all-gracious God, in Christ, the Savior-Judge." C. M. Jacobs: "But does not this clause of the Creed suggest—I will not venture to say that it teaches—another possibility? He descended into Hades, the place of the departed, that He might be their Savior too. . . . O God of the living and the dead, open our minds to the greatness of Thy Son, Jesus Christ, that we may never make His Gospel smaller than it is; help us to hope steadfastly in Thee, not only for ourselves, but for the whole race of men, for whom He died; and make us sure that all mankind shall see the glory which Thou hast revealed in Him." (*The Faith of the Church*, p. 62.) Friedrich Nietzsche: "Ueber den Ausgang des Gerichts an den Gottlosen ist schwer etwas auszusagen; ewige Verdammnis ist, weil infolge der menschlichen Freiheit kein Mensch zur Aufgabe seines Widerstandes und Ergreifung der Gnade gezwungen werden kann, ebenso moeglich wie die schliessliche Bekehrung aller Verlorenen." (See W. Oelsner, *Die Entwicklung der Eschatologie*, p. 53.) Seeberg's teaching is summarized by Oelsner (p. 75) thus: "Die Verdammnis aber als ewige anzusehen, verbieten schwere Bedenken: der Particularismus des Heils wuerde das Boese als wesentlich ewig in den Bereich des Gotteswillens hineinruecken; will aber der Allwirksame, dass das Boese ueberwunden werde, so darf er auch nicht ruhen, bis dieser Zweck so erfuehlt ist, dass endlich jeder Wille das Gute will." Just what does Bishop Stewart of Chicago teach as to eternal damnation? We read in *The Living Church*, March 10, 1934: "The recent questionnaire issued by a professor of Northwestern University dealing with a literal belief in a burning hell, the verbal inerrancy of the Holy Scriptures and the creation, is ridiculed by Bishop Stewart of Chicago, in a statement published in *The Diocese*. 'It is simply incredible that such questions should

be offered as tests of modernism,' says the Bishop. 'They have nothing to do with what is technically known as modernism. One does not go about hoarsely and excitedly and modernistically announcing that the world is round and not flat. One does not toss back and forth at night feverishly asking whether he dare accept the new theory of Copernicus that the sun moves. We have always supposed that intelligent persons could accept their Lord's teaching about hell as about heaven without accepting the poetical scenery of sulphur and smoke on the one hand and pearly gates and golden streets on the other. For the past 50 years or so no intelligent clergyman of the Church has held a theory of verbal inspiration of the Scriptures. And no one with even a whiff of theological learning confuses the cosmic significance of the Eternal Logos with His mission as the Incarnate Jesus of Nazareth born of the Virgin Mary. Nor has the Church with its theories of the *poena sensus* and the *poena damni* ever dogmatized on the character of infernal combustion.'

Some in this group teach both eternal damnation and apocatastasis. Peter Sterry, for instance, one of Cromwell's chaplains, a mystic, has this in his Catechism: "Q. What becomes of those who believe not in Christ? A. They lie under wrath while they live. Their souls are in prison with the devils at their death. At the end of the world their bodies are raised and joined to their souls; both are brought to judgment, both are cast into the lake that burns with fire and brimstone." The second part of the Catechism, however, uses somewhat different language, and in a letter to a friend he says: "Jesus Christ, as the universal Person, and Spirit in which all these subsisted, which alone truly subsisted in All, by dying, carried down the whole offended and polluted world into death; in that death all things are dissolved into their first principle, into the Divine Unity, into the Unity of the Eternal Spirit: Thus are the sins and the sinners no more for ever; thus all sins, sinners, wrath are swallowed up in the first unity of the Eternal Spirit, which is the fountain of Beauty, the fountain of Love." E. H. Plumptre, who quotes this, says: "These two extracts seem to contradict each other." (*The Spirits in Prison*, p. 193 f.)

Some in this group even go so far as to assert that Scripture itself teaches both doctrines—eternal damnation and

apocatastasis. H. Martensen, Bishop of Seeland, Denmark: "This antinomy meets us if we turn to Holy Scripture; no definite solution is given of it there. There are texts which, if they be taken in their full and literal import, most distinctly refer to eternal damnation. Matt. 25:41; Mark 9:44; Matt. 12:32; 1 John 5:16. These texts, if they be taken without reservation or refinement, clearly express the idea of a condemnation in which there is no cessation, to which there is no end. But on the other hand, there are contrasted expressions of Scripture, which have an equal claim to be taken in their full sense. 1 Cor. 15:26-28; Eph. 1:10; 1 Cor. 15:22. If we take these texts without limiting their full and obvious import, we shall not be far from the idea of a universal restoration; for the apostle says expressly *all*, not some. Cp. Matt. 19:26. This apparent contradiction in the language of Scripture shows that Scripture itself does not afford us a final dogmatic solution of the question." (*Christian Dogmatics*, p. 475.) According to Martensen the Christian preacher would and should preach eternal damnation on one Sunday and on the following Sunday the final restoration of all men. P. Althaus follows the same line of thought. "Drei verschiedene Zukunftsbilder traegt die dogmatische Ueberlieferung uns zu: den dualistischen Ausgang in ewiges Leben und ewigen Tod, die Vernichtung der Heillosen und die Wiederbringung aller. . . . Es ist bezeichnend, dass jede der drei genannten Lehren Gedanken der Heiligen Schrift fuer sich anfuehren kann." He adds: "Die Lehre von der Apokatastasis oder Wiederbringung, wenn sie den Anspruch macht, erschöpfende Beschreibung des Endes zu sein, ist und bleibt Vorwitz." He also adds: "Wenn Gottes Erwaehlen den Glauben wirkt, wie sollte die Demut uns nicht gewiss machen, dass die Liebe Gottes jedes anderen sich ebenso annehmen wird wie unser! . . . Wir fluechten immer wieder zu der Gewissheit der gnaedigen Macht, die alle heimfuehrt." He concludes with the statement: "Gewiss kann nur das eine wahr sein," only one of these thoughts *expressed in Scripture* can be true. (*Die Letzten Dinge*, pp. 175-189.) And Folke Holmstroem calls this method of teaching both truths — "die Vorstellung eines doppelten Ausgangs" and "die zuversichtliche Hoffnung einer endlichen Wiederbringung aller" (Althaus, p. 186) a stroke of genius — "Althaus' genialer Griff." (*Das Eschatologische*

*Denken der Gegenwart*, p. 308.) Dr. Adolf Koeberle seems to have the same idea: "In the New Testament the two thoughts run parallel" (*op. cit.*, pp. 70—73). — See the item in *CONC. THEOL. MONTHLY*, 1937, p. 214 f.: "Bejaht die Schrift, was sie verneint?"<sup>2</sup>

## 1

This apocatastasis gospel is a vicious teaching. It directly denies the plain teaching of Scripture. Holy Scripture tells the wicked, the unbelievers, that they shall be cast into the fire of hell, to suffer eternal damnation. Jesus will say to them on the Day of Judgment: "Depart from Me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." "These shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal" (Matt. 25:41, 46). Jesus spoke

<sup>2</sup> We submit some statements by infidels, atheists, agnostics, who deny not merely the eternity of damnation, but hell itself. Their violent language is fully matched by that of some of the liberal theologians. We are not classifying these with the atheists, but are calling attention to the similarity of language both groups employ. Bertrand Russell's book: "*Why I Am Not a Christian*" declares: "There is one very serious defect to my mind in Christ's moral character, and that is that he believed in hell. I do not myself feel that any person who is really profoundly human can believe in everlasting punishment. . . . Jesus goes on, in Matt. 13:42, about the wailing and gnashing of teeth. It comes in one verse after another, and it is quite manifest to the reader that there is a certain pleasure in contemplating wailing and gnashing of teeth or else it would not occur so often." (Quoted in Sydney Cave, *op. cit.*, p. 145.) On the occasion of Luther Burbank's funeral in 1926, at which in compliance with his wish the famous tribute of Robert Ingersoll at the grave of the great agnostic's brother was read, the papers reported: "Appearing in the pulpit of the First Congregational Church in San Francisco, Burbank declared he had 'nominated himself an "infidel" so as to cause people to think.' . . . The idea that a good God would send people to a burning hell is utterly damnable to me. The ravings of insanity; superstition gone to seed. I don't want to have anything to do with such a God. I am a lover of men and Christ as a man and his work, and all things that help humanity, but nevertheless, just as he was an infidel then, I am an infidel today." David Friedrich Strauss: "Das Jenseits ist der letzte Feind, welchen die spekulative Kritik zu bekaempfen und womoeglich zu ueberwinden hat." (See A. Hoenecke, *Ev.-Luth. Dogmatik*, IV, p. 311.) "Mark Twain makes Satan reproach God as one who 'mouths justice and invented hell; mouths mercy and invented hell; . . . mouths morals to other people and has none himself; . . . frowns upon crimes, yet commits them all.'" William Adams Brown quotes this in *Beliefs That Matter*, p. 285, in this connection: "There is, for example, the doctrine of everlasting punishment. . . . But this doctrine of retribution, morally defensible and even necessary as it is, was associated with a conception of future punishment so appalling both in its quality and in its duration as to make the thought of the future a nightmare for many sensitive spirits. . . . We can understand the bitterness with which Mark Twain makes Satan, etc. Much may be lost with the loss of the life after death. At least we are delivered from the hell of our fathers."



through His Prophet: "Many shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt" (Dan. 12:2). Jesus declared in the days of His earthly ministry: "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life, and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him" (John 3:36). "It is better for thee to enter life with one eye rather than having two eyes to be cast into hell fire. It is better for thee to enter life halt or maimed than having two eyes to be cast into everlasting fire . . . into the fire that shall never be quenched, where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched" (Matt. 18:8-9; Mark 9:42-48). Jesus, who will have all men to be saved, had His holy Apostles write these words: "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with His mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of His power" (2 Thess. 1:7-9). And these words: "To whom is reserved the blackness of darkness forever" (Jude 13). And these words: "The smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever . . . tormented day and night forever and ever" (Rev. 14:11; 20:10). St. John exhausts the resources of the human language to express the concept of the endlessness of damnation: "εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων," "for the aeons of the aeons," "von Ewigkeit zur Ewigkeit" (Luther). And there is Heb. 9:27! Man's eternal fate is not decided at some period in the aeons of eternity, but at the moment of his death.<sup>3</sup> — "Scripture teaches the fact of eternal damnation so clearly and emphatically that no one can deny it unless he rejects the authority of Scripture." (F. Pieper, *Christliche Dogmatik*, III, p. 611.) And Delitzsch writes: "There is no

<sup>3</sup> Under the compulsion of Holy Scripture the Athanasian Creed confesses: "They that have done good shall go into life everlasting; and they that have done evil, into everlasting fire. This is the catholic faith," the creed of Christendom. And the Augsburg Confession, Art. 17: "They condemn the Anabaptists, who think that there will be an end to the punishments of condemned men and devils." And the Apology: "Christ shall condemn the ungodly to be punished with the devil without end." And the Large Catechism: "They abide in eternal wrath and damnation." (*Triglotta*, p. 697.) And the Westminster Confession, Chapter 33: "The wicked, who know not God and obey not the Gospel of Jesus Christ, shall be cast into eternal torments and be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of His power." And the Heidelberg Catechism, Q. 52: "Who shall cast all His and my enemies into everlasting condemnation," etc.



teaching which flouts Holy Scripture more flagrantly than the apocatastasis." (*Biblische Psychologie*, p. 412. See *Proceedings, Texas Dist.*, 1907, p. 51.)

There are those among the restorationists who admit that Scripture teaches eternal damnation, but openly declare that they do not accept Scripture as the authoritative Word of God. Theodore Parker readily acknowledged that eternal punishment is taught in the New Testament. He declared: "There is no doubt that Jesus Christ taught the endless suffering of the wicked. But I do not accept the doctrine on His authority." (See *The Bible Companion*, October, 1922, p. 383.) He would not accept it because it "sneers at common sense, spits upon reason and makes God a devil." Charles Eaton, who denounces this teaching as "blasphemous," goes on to say: "God is immanent in human nature also. . . . God has never left Himself without a witness. Inspiration is not and cannot be confined to any favored or selected prophets. . . . To limit revelation to the Bible is to finally destroy religion." (*Why I Am*, p. 68.) Lewis B. Fisher (Universalist), who declares that this doctrine "made the universe a chamber of horrors and a madhouse for countless sensitive people," that "theology should not make the universe an insane asylum and God hateful," also says: "We, with all Protestants, have affirmed the liberty of each soul to think for itself, itself to judge what is truth, to follow its 'inner light,' accountable to no human authority, but to God only," and, "Jesus never wrote a word, and never asked any one else to do so. All we know is what his reporters have handed to us, in reports written from fifty to a hundred years after his birth." (*Which Way?* Pp. 15, 66, 118, 124.) This book is "a plain statement of what Universalists are believing now, in this new age, with its new Bible, its new science . . . its new theology." (Preface.) Dr. S. Shepard, quoted above, says: "Such details as the origin and nature of the Bible, the birth, death, and resurrection of Jesus are matters upon which each individual must form his own opinions, probably changing them from time to time." (See Weber, *op. cit.*, p. 199.) "Archbishop Tillotson saw reason to believe that God might restore the lost by the superabundance of His mercy, though he considered that the letter of Scripture pointed the other way." (See Farrar, *op. cit.*, p. 175.) Archdeacon Storr, quoted above, says: "The

older traditional belief in hell and in endless punishment was based upon a literal acceptance of certain passages in the Bible. But the growth of modern Biblical scholarship has profoundly altered our view of inspiration. We no longer feel that a statement is necessarily true because it is in the Bible." (*Op. cit.*, p. 208.)

The conservatives among the restorationists will not, of course, use such coarse language. They recognize the authority of Scripture. But at this point they refuse to bow to the authority of Scripture. Anyone who in the face of the clear statement of Scripture that "these shall go away into everlasting punishment" insists that no man will suffer everlasting punishment, is certainly not bowing to the authority of Scripture. While the left wing openly declares that the authority of Scripture may be rejected, the right wing, which stands for the authority of Scripture, is virtually brushing it aside. The only difference between the two wings is that the left wing denies more, many more, Scriptural truths than the right wing. F. S. Downs is right in saying: "Better renounce the authority of the Bible at once than trifle in this way with its most solemn fact." (*The Heart of the Christian Faith*, p. 200.)

True, most restorationists deny that they are rejecting the authority of Scripture and insist that Scripture does not teach the endlessness of damnation. A few, indeed, as we have pointed out above, admit that Scripture plainly teaches it, but the great majority claim that neither Jesus nor any of His Apostles taught it. L. B. Fisher: "No candid person can believe that the doctrine of endless hell torments is taught in the Bible. . . . The Bible, rightly understood, is a Universalist book. . . . It is worth noting that the Bible never once spoke of everlasting death, or everlasting hell." (*Op. cit.*, pp. 68, 74, 95.) Farrar: "The silence of St. Paul as to any such doctrine in such passages as Rom. 2: 8-9; 5: 21; 6: 23; Gal. 5: 21; 6: 8; Phil. 3: 18-19; the reticence of St. John in such passages as 1 John 3: 14-15; 5: 16 — in all which places the nature of the subjects handled would have led the Apostles to make explicit mention of endless torment, had they embraced any such belief — cannot by any possibility be the result of accident. "That the doctrinal writings of these three chief teachers of the Gospel (St. Paul, St. Peter, and St. John)

are wholly destitute of any assertion of the endless misery of sinners in the literal sense,' says Mr. White, 'can be verified by every reader.' (Op. cit., p. 218 f.) "It seems to me that . . . endless torments are nowhere clearly taught — the passages which appear to teach that doctrine being either obviously figurative or historically misunderstood." (Op. cit., p. 227.) In the *Christian Century* of Jan. 7, 1934, Prof. H. L. Willett answered the question: "Does it not seem a strange and repellent idea that Jesus should have given his sanction to the Jewish doctrine of eternal punishment? I am thinking particularly of his references to the 'fire that is not quenched,' 'these shall go away into everlasting punishment,'" thus: "... His primary purpose was not the portrayal of the future life. He never issued a blueprint dealing with that subject. . . . He used the Jewish figures of speech or the framework of the picture, but went straight to the heart of the matter by his insistence that as long as willful evil persists in the disposition of any life, there will be the consequent suffering." The *Pulpit Commentary* on Luke 16:19 ff.: "Between a soul thus godless and the holy dead, who are at rest in the Lord, there is a great gulf fixed. But to press this into an argument for a hell of endless torment is to overstep the limits of parabolic interpretation." (P. 74.)<sup>4</sup> Sydney Cave relies upon Higher Criticism to prove the thesis that the Bible does not teach eternal damnation. In answer to B. Russell, who had quoted Matt. 13:42 to show "the serious defect in Christ's moral character" (see above), he writes: "The words of Jesus which he (B. R.) claims teach everlasting punishment are, indeed, perplexing, and on them have been based terrific theories which contradict our Lord's central teaching of the unwearying, holy love of God. Mr. Russell deals with the passages on the lines of the crudest and most ignorant fundamentalism, and ignores altogether the difference between the earlier and more authentic version of these sayings in St. Mark and St. Luke and that given in St. Matthew, which, as we have seen, represents the harsher teaching of Palestinian Christianity; actually this phrase ('wailing

<sup>4</sup> On page 81, however, we read: "Jesus Christ was using current language and familiar imagery to intimate to us that the man who has lived a selfish and worldly life will meet with severe condemnation and grievous penalty in the next world, a penalty in regard to which he has no right to expect either mitigation or release."

and gnashing of teeth'), though found six times in Matthew, is not found in Mark and only once in Luke. And he treats as genuine sayings which, as even a glance at the Revised Version margin would have told him, 'are omitted by the best ancient authorities' (Mark 9:44-46)." (*Op. cit.*, p.176. — We don't understand. The marginal note in the American Standard Version and in the Revised Standard Version reads: "Verses 44 and 46: 'where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched' — *which are identical with verse 48* — are omitted by the best ancient authorities. Would not verse 48 make the saying genuine?) — There is nothing to the plea that Scripture often uses figurative language in describing the eternal things. In the nature of the case Scripture is compelled to use much figurative language. Moreover, there is nothing obscure about such figurative language as "their worm dieth not." Besides, Scripture employs a lot of language which is not figurative. Every single word in the statement: "The wrath of God abideth on him" must be taken in the most proper sense. Not a single word in the statement: "These shall go away into everlasting punishment" is a figurative expression. — No, the Apostles did not always, in describing the future punishment, add the adjective "endless." They used that word often enough elsewhere. And Paul found the words "indignation," "wrath," "tribulation," "anguish" sufficiently strong for the purpose at hand. It is a good thing that Farrar himself, as he wrote his books, did not apply the law he lays down for the Apostles. — No comment is necessary on Cave's and the Higher Critics' manipulation of Scripture.

Scripture does not teach eternal damnation, say the restorationists, for the word αἰώνιος, translated "eternal," does not mean what the Greek scholars and the Greek laymen, the English scholars and the English laymen, have always understood it to mean — everlasting, endless, eternal. They consider this one of their strongest points. They write long chapters on it. The word, when used in connection with damnation, punishment, hell, can only mean "for a certain period," never an infinite period. We read in *Which Way?*: "The third word that Canon Farrar declared should be expunged from our English Bible is the word 'everlasting.' Presumably he meant that that word should not be applied to sin and to its punishments as necessarily meaning endless."

(P. 95. — The two other words are "hell" and "damnation.") "The true version of Matt. 25:46 is: 'These shall go away into the punishment of the ages, and the righteous into the life of the ages.'" (P. 97.) "As to 'everlasting,' while it was many times applied to life and to salvation, it is worth noting that the Bible never once spoke of everlasting death, or everlasting hell." (P. 95.) Farrar: "It has been so ably proved by so many writers that there is no authority whatever for rendering aeonian 'everlasting,'" "Jeremy Taylor declared that the word 'everlasting' signifies only to the end of its proper period." (*Op. cit.*, p. 62, 197.) Koeberle: "Zinzendorf, Bengel, und Blumhardt haben darauf hingewiesen: das neutestamentliche Wort *aionios*, das wir gern mit 'ewig' uebersetzen und wodurch die Kirche zu der Lehre von einer ewigen Verdammnis gekommen sei, dieses Wort bedeute in Wahrheit ja: einen Weltalter-Abschnitt lang waehrend." (*Op. cit.*, p. 72.)

That will not do. In the language of the world and in the Bible our word sometimes means "enduring for a long period," but usually it means "endless, enduring forever and ever — eternal." There cannot be a moment's doubt that when Scripture declares that the unbeliever shall receive "everlasting" punishment, it means "everlasting," for it uses the same word when it speaks of the "eternal" life, which receives believers at the end of the present aeon. "These shall go away into everlasting (αἰώνιον) punishment, but the righteous into life eternal (αἰώνιον)" (Matt. 25:46). The restorationists, since they are not materialists, believe in the life eternal. They have no trouble with Matt. 25:46 b. But it surely troubles them when their theory compels them to make the "everlasting" in Matt. 25:46a mean a period which will come to an end. In the words of *The Australian Lutheran*: "Holy Scripture teaches the *endlessness* of this conscious suffering in hell. Objectors say that the word translated *eternal*, *everlasting*, literally means nothing more than age-long, long time. But let the reader note that the word *aionios* (eternal, everlasting) is used of the future life of the believer, of God's own being, of the blessings of the Gospel. In all these cases even our opponents do not think of limiting its duration. Six times it is used of the punishment of the wicked (Matt. 18:8; 25:41, 46; Mark 3:29; 2 Thess. 1:9; Jude 7). What valid



reason is there for arbitrarily limiting its duration here? To limit its duration in Matt. 25:46, where the same word is used for the reward of the righteous, is impossible. . . . 'Forever and ever' in Rev. 20:10 literally means 'unto the ages of the ages,' that is, age rolling upon age in endless succession." (See the *Lutheran Witness*, 1939, p. 165.) Otto von Gerlach, who is for the Hades gospel, writes: "The same adjective is used in describing 'punishment' and 'life.' Augustine says, *De Civ. Dei*, XXI:23: 'How is it possible to account eternal punishment to be a fire of long duration, and eternal life to be without end, since Christ comprised both in the very same passage, in one and the same sentence, saying, "These shall go into eternal punishment, but the righteous into life eternal?"' If both are eternal, either both must be understood to be lasting with an end or both perpetual without end. For like is related to like; on the one side eternal punishment, on the other, eternal life. But to say in one and the same sentence, life eternal shall be without end, punishment eternal shall have an end, were too absurd; hence, since the eternal life of the saints shall be without end, punishment eternal too shall doubtless have no end to those whose it shall be." (*Das Neue Testament mit erklärenden Anmerkungen*, p. 160.) And Archdeacon Storr, who is at heart for the apocatastasis gospel, writes: "Whatever may be the meaning of 'aeonian,' we must note that the word is used in the New Testament of the fate both of the good and the bad, and we cannot logically give it one meaning in one case, and a different meaning in the other case. We may revolt against the idea of endless punishment; but if we are basing our argument upon the meaning of special words, we must remember that the same adjective is used of both life and penalty." (*Op. cit.*, p. 229.)<sup>5</sup>

<sup>5</sup> We have space for a few more statements. Professor Moses Stuart: "If then the words *aion* and *aionios* are applied sixty times in the New Testament to designate the continuance of the future existence of the righteous and at least twelve times to designate the continuance of the future misery of the wicked, by what principle of interpreting language does it become possible for us to avoid the conclusion that *aion* and *aionios* have the same sense in both cases? The result seems to me to be plain and philologically and exegetically certain. It is this — we must either admit the endless misery of hell or give up the endless happiness of heaven." (See *The Bible Champion*, Oct., 1922, p. 383.) *The Pulpit Commentary*, on Matt. 18:8-9: "Everlasting fire. . . . It is not morally expedient to minimize the force of such terms by disputing about the exact connotation of 'aeonian.' When we remember that the words are spoken by the loving and pitiful Savior, we must allow that



Then, too, the paraphrastic terms used Mark 9:43-46: "Their worm dieth not," "The fire shall never be quenched," and Rev. 14:11: "The smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever," and John 3:36: "The wrath of God abideth on him," force us to take *aionion* punishment to mean 'unending' damnation. And, finally, the very nature of the coming aeon, as distinguished from the present aeon, is timelessness, endlessness. Dr. A. L. Graebner says: "Αἰώνιος can here refer to but one aeon, the αἰὼν μέλλων, αἰὼν ἐκείνος, as it describes that which is to come at the end of the world, when the present aeon, αἰὼν οὗτος, shall be over and past. And the coming aeon is endless, eternity. And among the words that shall abide when heaven and earth shall pass away is also this: 'They shall go away into *everlasting* punishment; but the righteous into life *eternal*.'" (*Theol. Quarterly*, 1902, p. 143.) And Jesus will speak these words at the *Last Judgment*. It will

they point to some dreadful reality." On Matt. 25:46: "Apparently Jesus meant to convey by these words the impression which every simple-minded, unbiased reader receives from them, that the duration of the punishment of the lost equals the duration of the blessedness of the saved. The word translated 'everlasting' in the one clause and 'eternal' in the other is the same in both clauses. . . . The bliss pronounced and the punishment threatened would be understood to last so long as the subject of them lasts unless *explicit* intimation were given that it would not be so." Dr. W. R. Inge, dean of St. Paul's, in his contribution to the symposium *What Is Hell?* puts it thus: "It is hardly too much to say that heaven and hell stand and fall together. Those who refuse to believe in the possibility of final reprobation will usually be found ready to secularize religion, and to substitute some dream of 'a good time coming' for the blessed hope of everlasting life. . . . It is then that we face the dread alternative, the choice which, so far as we know, is for us endless in its results." He has no patience with those who would try to make words like "eternal" mean anything else than eternal. (See *The Literary Digest*, April 5, 1930. *The Presbyterian*, June 5, 1930.) — Schaff-Herzog pronounces the verdict: "Whatever these words, κόλασις, αἰώνιον, may be made to mean *under the stress of a theory*" (our italics), the plain meaning which they carry upon their face is that which the Church has always put upon them. . . . These words (Matt. 25:46) cannot be explained away by speculation, or deprived of their obvious meaning by exegesis." — Kittel's Woerterbuch: "Im Neuen Testament wird αἰώνιος in der Bedeutung *ewig* gebraucht von Gott. Als Gottespraedikat enthaelt αἰώνιος nicht nur den Begriff der unbegrenzten anfangs- und endlosen Zeit, sondern zugleich den der die Zeit transzendierenden Ewigkeit. . . . In diesem Sinn wird es gebraucht von den goettlichen Guetern und Gaben — σωτηρία αἰώνιος, Heb. 5:9; Mark 16 (kurzer Schluss). . . . Enthaelt αἰώνιος in diesen Ausdruecken den vollen Begriff der goettlichen Ewigkeit, so bedeutet es in τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον, Matt. 18:8; 25:41; Jude 7; κόλασις αἰώνιος, Matt. 25:46, zunaechst nur *niemals aufhoerend*, endlos. Aber ein Ausdruck wie κόμα αἰώνιον, Heb. 6:2 . . . zeigt, dass auch hier das rein zeitliche Verstaendnis nicht ausreicht. Zum Gedanken der ewigen Strafe vergleiche Apk. 14:11; 20:10."

not be reversed at some later period. The αἰὼν μέλλων knows no change.

Does Scripture teach eternal damnation? Dr. E. B. Pusey, Canon of Christ Church, makes this significant statement: "They who deny that any of the words used of future punishment in Holy Scripture express eternity would do well to consider whether there is any way in which Almighty God *could* have expressed it, which they would have accepted as meaning it." (*What Is of Faith As to Everlasting Punishment?* p. 44. — A reply to Dr. Farrar's book.)<sup>6</sup>

The restorationists not only deny that Scripture teaches eternal damnation, but also assert that Scripture teaches the ultimate salvation of the damned. They quote Acts 3:21: "Until the times of restitution of all things."<sup>7</sup> But the ἀποκατάστασις of Acts 3:21a is the accomplishment of all the prophecies, as 21b shows. That is corroborated by Matt. 17:11, which says that John the Baptist ἀποκαταστήσει πάντα.

<sup>6</sup> We ought to hear what the restorationists offer in rebuttal. *Which Way?* disposes of our argument based on Matt. 25:46 thus: "They say that if eonian punishment is not endless then eonian life is not either. This strikes the Universalist as about as convincing an argument as it would be to assert that when a hat and a monument are both called 'high' they must therefore be the same height." (P. 100.) No comment. — Farrar asks those who argue from Matt. 25:46 "to apply identically the same argument, analogously, to such texts as 1 Cor. 15:22: 'As in Adam *all*' die, even so in Christ shall *all* be made alive.'" (Op. cit., p. 199.) And *Which Way?* thinks it is a very good argument. "Farrar challenged his critics, who insisted that the same word must always mean the same thing, to apply that opinion, if they dared to, to the text: 'As in Adam *all* die, etc.'" (P. 101.) Martensen presents the argument in about the same words. (Op. cit., p. 476.) As it happens, the two "alls" in our text have the very same meaning: *all believers*. See the context. (Lenski on our passage; E. B. Pusey, p. 37, etc.) — In "*What Is Hell?*" Bishop J. E. C. Welldon says that Christ's words "can not be literally accepted; they are allegorical or metaphorical. . . . The simple fact that the future life is *timeless* is in itself enough to dispel the nightmare of everlasting punishment." Because eternity is timeless, the punishment may come to an end? Farrar has the same idea: "When you foist into this word αἰώνιος the fiction of endless time, you do but give the lie to the mighty oath of that great angel who . . . swore by Him who liveth for ever and ever that 'Time should be no more.'" (Op. cit., p. 79.) *Hier steht einem der Verstand stille*. Eternity is timeless, absolutely. Timeless, therefore changeless. We cannot understand the reasoning that "timelessness" leaves room for a change in the condition of the damned.

<sup>7</sup> Hosea Ballou: "The fulness of times will come and the times of the restitution of all things will be accomplished. Then shall universal songs of honor be sung to the praise of Him who liveth for ever and ever. . . . The blessed hand of the once Crucified shall wipe tears from off all faces. . . ." (See *Which Way?* p. 46.)

(See Pieper, *op. cit.*, II, p. 457.) — They quote Rom. 5:18: "The free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." Yes, all men are justified objectively. But the text does not state that those who rejected universal justification in this life will finally, in hell, accept it. — They quote 1 Cor. 15:28. But this text only states that the enemies will be subjugated; it does not say that they will be converted to God and Christ. Just read v. 26! (See Hoenecke, *op. cit.*, IV, p. 309.) — They quote Phil. 2:10 f. What this text says is: "The first are all the blessed angels and the saints in heaven; the second are all the men on earth; the third are all the demons and the damned in hell. All shall bow in submission and make the acknowledgment or confession, either with joy and bliss or with dismay." (Lenski.) They quote, of course, 1 Cor. 15:22. But see above. — They quote Eph. 1:10. But the text speaks of those things that take place in "the fullness of times," the era of the New Testament (see Gal. 4:4), not of what takes place in the future world. (See Stoeckhardt on our passage. He quotes Hodge: "The inhabitants of heaven, or the angels, and the inhabitants of the earth, or the saints, are to be united as a harmonious whole under Christ.") — They quote 1 Pet. 3:19. (See CONC. THEOL. MONTHLY, 1945, p. 384. Knopf.) Christ preached eternal damnation to the spirits in prison. — They also quote Is. 24:22: "And after many days they shall be visited." But it will not be a gracious visitation. After many days will come the dread Day of Judgment. (See v. 23: "Visited" — A. V. margin: "Found wanting." Revised V.: "Punished." Moffatt: "Till their day of doom arrives." Weimar-Bibel: "Daher auch die alten Kirchenlehrer diesen Text auf den Juengsten Gerichtstag deuten.")

There is no Scriptural authority for the apocatastasis. On the contrary, "Scripture teaches the fact of eternal damnation so clearly and emphatically that no one can deny it unless he rejects the authority of Scripture."

The only way to save the apocatastasis would be to say with Archbishop Tillotson (see *Proceedings, Texas Dist.*, 1907, p. 45) that God indeed threatens the sinners with eternal damnation, not as though He intends to carry out the threat, but merely for the purpose of rousing them out of their spiritual apathy. — Nothing more is needed utterly to destroy the trustworthiness and authority of Scripture.

## 2

Restorationism is a wicked teaching in that it places reason above Scripture. It listens to the voice of carnal reason rather than to the voice of God. The chief argument for the apocatastasis gospel is based on the rationalistic consideration that God would dishonor and disgrace Himself if He consigned any of His creatures to everlasting damnation. With most of the restorationists the "Scripture" proof is of minor importance. What they stress is that God's mercy and His justice compel Him ultimately to quench the fires of hell. We must "save the glory and honor of God." God "is the God of grace." "Every soul will meet with justice." "The unwearying holy love of God cannot stand for "everlasting punishment." (See above.) "But endless punishment! Hopeless misery! I acknowledge my *inability* to admit this belief together with a belief in the divine goodness — the belief that 'God is love,' that 'His tender mercies are over all His works.'" (John Foster, quoted in Farrar, *op. cit.*, p. 204.) Dr. L. Schneller: "God in hell (Ps. 138:8) is still the God who would have all men to be saved. Or do you imagine that God is in hell only to take vengeance and to gloat over the agonies of the lost and the damned? He is there to save through the fire of judgment all that can possibly be saved." See CONC. THEOL. MONTHLY, 1936, p. 440.) The doctrine of eternal damnation is "blasphemous" (see above); it makes "God a devil." But all of this is rationalism, pure and simple.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>8</sup> L. Schneller is an annihilationist. A word on annihilationism. "This theory of the final extinction of sinful and unyielding souls is the only possible rival of universalism," says *The Winchester Centennial*, p. 41. Both universalism and annihilationism denounce the idea of eternal damnation as incompatible with the mercy of God. The annihilationist Th. Traub: "Our Christian faith will not permit us to believe in the endlessness of the punishment in hell. As far as we can see, it is incompatible with God's love and with His justice. God's justice cannot permit Him to punish sins committed in time with tortures of unnumbered billions of years. And of what benefit is this endless punishment to God, and how does it benefit the damned? . . . Michael Hahn has well said: 'One who believes in endless damnation cannot rest at ease if he has one spark of God's love and mercy in his heart.'" (*Von den letzten Dingen*, p. 284f.) "Question: Do you think a benevolent God would consign a human soul to everlasting torment in hell? Answer: The expressions 'eternal punishment' and 'eternal fire' occur in parables and sayings of a symbolic character. . . . God wills not the death of a single sinner, but, rather, that all men should turn unto him and live. . . . The passages in question do not teach the endless torture of human beings, but rather the absolute extinction of willfully rebellious souls." (S. Parkes Cadman, *Answers to Everyday Questions*, p. 287.) A writer

It is a thought nowhere expressed in God's Word that God may not, because of His mercy and justice, punish the unbeliever with eternal damnation. This thought springs from corrupt human reason. Rationalism begets restorationism. Let reason be your guide, and you will inevitably land in restorationism or annihilationism. Luther: "This is what we come to when we attempt, by human reason, to limit and make excuses for God, not revering the secrets of His Majesty, but curiously prying into them. . . . We prate like madmen, both against God and against ourselves, when we are all the while supposing that we are, with a great deal of wisdom, speaking both for God and for ourselves. . . . Setting aside faith, reason wants to feel out, and see, and comprehend *how* He can be good and not cruel. But she will comprehend that, when this shall be said of God: "He hardens no one, He damns no one, but He has mercy upon all, He saves all; and He has so utterly destroyed hell that no future punishment need be dreaded. It is thus that reason blusters and contends, in attempting to clear God, and to defend Him as just and good." (*The Bondage of the Will*, pp. 217, 220. St. L. Ed. XVIII:1832. Cp. X:2002.) It is because they listen to their reason that men preach the apocatastasis gospel. They say so themselves, many of them. They ask us: Do you want us to "sneer at common sense and spit upon reason"? They glory in giving reason its rights.

But it is a wicked business. "Men derive this dogma from their reason, *their* sense of justice, *their* conception of mercy. And men have not the right to use the argument under discussion. For what it amounts to is this: reason presumes to tell God what He must do in order to retain His character as a merciful and just God. And shall reason teach God ethics? Presumptuous reason is telling God that unless He conducts His judgment according to human standards, His conduct would be unfair, partial, unrighteous, unethical. . . .

---

in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Oct., 1926, p. 405, and Jan., 1927, p. 59, declaring on the basis of the passages that speak of God's love that endless damnation is incompatible with the nature of God, says: "The horrid doctrine that so long has covered the benign face of the Deity with a black cloud of human creation, the doctrine of eternal torment . . . is utterly false." Other annihilationists: Socinians, Adventists, Russellites, C. Stange, Th. Zahn. The annihilationists believe in "merciful" extinction. The Scripture proof is 2 Thess. 1:9 ("everlasting destruction"); Rev. 20:14; and similar texts.



Will a man judge God?" (CONC. THEOL. MONTHLY, 1945, p. 395.) These words were addressed to the Hades theologians, who demand, because of their "merciful" sentiments, that God must save half of the inmates of hell, Hades. They apply no less to the apocatastasis theologians, who because of their sense of "mercy and justice," require God to lead all the damned out of hell to heaven. And since the God of the Bible speaks a different language, they make out of the God of the Bible "a devil." Presumptuous reason will stop at nothing.

Reason blusters that a just God cannot punish the sinner with the damnation of hell. It is inconceivable that the rationalist would appeal to the justice of God in this connection, the divine justice and holiness of Him whose wrath is revealed from heaven against all unrighteousness (Rom. 1:18), who will render to every man according to his deeds (Rom. 2:6), before whose judgment seat all must appear, that every one may receive the things done in his body (2 Cor. 5:10), whose judgment is righteous (2 Thess. 1:5-9; Acts 17:31), who will pronounce judgment without mercy (James 2:13). And if carnal reason will not listen to the terrible (2 Cor. 5:11: "the terror of the Lord") voice of God in Scripture, it should listen to the voice of conscience, which tells every man that he will be judged on the Last Day by Him who condones not one sin and cannot but execute the judgment of damnation against the unbeliever. Reason is unreasonable when it protests against the just judgment of God, for it can do so only by suppressing the voice of conscience and blinding itself. As long as men believe in a God and have a conscience, they cannot deny the reality of hell. Schaff-Herzog: "The fact of future retribution cannot *reasonably* be denied by any except those who hold a pantheistic or materialistic theory of the universe."

But reason blusters that it would be unjust on the part of God to punish a temporal sin eternally. Thus Th. Traub (see above). Archdeacon Storr: "Is it consonant with the Divine Love and justice that an eternity of woe should be the punishment for the wrong choices of a few years?" (*Op. cit.*, p. 210.) Bishop Thomas Newton: "To suppose that a man's happiness and misery to all eternity should absolutely and unchangeably be fixed and determined by the uncertain be-



havior of a few years in this life is an unreasonable supposition." (See Plumptre, p. 203. Cp. p. 199.) The trouble with carnal reason is that it has no conception of the enormity of sin and of the holiness of God. It will not even heed what the natural law, written in the heart of fallen man, says concerning the enormity of sin and the holiness of God. And on the findings of this blind reason restorationism and annihilationism dare to charge the Lord, "the righteous Judge," with injustice. Schaff-Herzog: "The objection that men deserve lenient treatment because of their disadvantages would be an argument against *any* if against *eternal* punishment. The objection that sins do not deserve eternal punishment assumes that we can measure the turpitude of sin."<sup>9</sup>

<sup>9</sup> Carnal reason operates with a lot of additional arguments in support of its claim that it knows more about this matter than Scripture. For instance (1): "If God succeeds," says Dr. Gordon of Boston, one of the brightest minds among the Congregationalists, "if God succeeds, universal salvation will be the result." (*The Winchester Centennial*, p. 40.) That means that Satan and man do not have the power to set themselves against the gracious will of God. And that means that the restorationists have no conception of the frightful nature of the corruption and evil in man and Satan. (2) "The great Physician" does not kill his patients in his efforts to cure them." (*Which Way?* p. 22.) There are patients who refuse the ministrations of the physician. There are sinners who put themselves beyond help. (3) Farrar: "It was the doctrine of endless torments which made an infidel of the elder Mill. . . . It was this, too, that chiefly made Theodore Parker a Unitarian." (*Op. cit.*, p. LVII.) Farrar is advising God to destroy hell because men hate the doctrine of hell. (4) Th. Zahn: "It is hardly conceivable that the children of God could enjoy eternal bliss if they knew that a hell full of tortured spirits existed eternally." (*Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*, on Rev. 21:8.) Th. Traub has the same notion, *op. cit.*, p. 286. Schleiermacher, too. (See C. Stange, *Das Ende aller Dinge*, p. 197.) How do the annihilationists and restorationists know that? (5) They say further that the doctrine of the eternal damnation of a part of mankind would involve Dualism and Dualism is inconceivable. Martensen: "Must this world's development then end in a Dualism?" (*Op. cit.*, p. 474.) C. Stange: "Schleiermacher has already shown why there cannot be a final Dualismus. . . . And Althaus acknowledges this when he says: 'Wir muessen vom Gottesgedanken aus Bedenken erheben gegen das dualistische Endresultat.'" (*Op. cit.*, p. 196f.) And thus a host of others. But all this talk is purely philosophical speculation. How are you going to prove it? — *The Winchester Centennial* offers this proof: "Endless hell would be a confession of God's failure, as though the Almighty should say, 'I can not cure your sin, but I can torment you forever.' . . . The Universalist faith is absolute belief in an adequate God, who is able to conduct his universe to the goal of his desires without inflicting an eternal catastrophe upon any of his creatures. . . . Universalism is faith in the success of God, the sure triumph of his righteousness and the eternal reign of his love." (*Op. cit.*, p. 146—148.) But see (1) Can you prove with philosophy that man does not have the fatal capacity to withstand God to the utmost, to the bitter end? We, forsaking philosophical argumentations, which are endless, follow Scripture and

declare that man has that fatal capacity. The history of mankind will end in Dualism. (See *Lehre und Wehre*, 1923, p. 232. *Conc. Theol. Monthly*, 1938, p. 576. Pieper, *op. cit.*, III, p. 612.) (6) "The Hades theologians never fail to quote the passages proclaiming the universality of redemption and the universality of God's gracious will." (*Conc. Theol. Monthly*, 1945, p. 391.) And these very same passages (2 Pet. 3:9; Ezek. 33:11; 1 Tim. 2:4, etc., etc.) are quoted by the Universalists. And they have much to say about the "universale Bestimmung des Christentums" (p. 384). And Seeberg declares that "damnation cannot last eternally because of the 'universality of salvation'; for if He who worketh all things really wills that the evil be vanquished, He cannot rest till this purpose is accomplished and finally every will wills the good." (See Oelsner, *op. cit.*, p. 75.) Surely, Christ redeemed all men, and God would have all men to be saved. It should follow from this that all men would accept the universal grace of God, but see (1) and (5). The bottomless wickedness of man frustrates the gracious purpose of God. (7) The punishment in hell, they say, is not retributive but reformatory. C. H. Eaton: "The doctrinal teaching of the Universalist Church is . . . (4): The certainty of punishment, having for its object the final recovery of all men." (See above.) "If the punishments of God have a loving and healing purpose, they must continue until that purpose is accomplished, and then must cease." (*Which Way?* p. 100.) "The infliction of punishment, which is purely retributive and in no sense disciplinary, is not consonant with the purposes of a God of love and moral character. . . . A merely retributive punishment is simply vengeance." (See Storr, *op. cit.*, p. 218.) These men know nothing of the divine penology as revealed in Scripture. And their knowledge of human penology is also faulty. *The Theological Quarterly*, 1902, p. 142f.: "To say that eternal punishment is incompatible with the purpose of punitive justice, the reform of the culprit, is an error based upon an error. Chastisement aims at the reform of the delinquent, punishment as such, never. It is not reformatory, but vindictive in its nature. Rom. 12:19: 'Vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord.' At the last day, the Son of man will come as a judge, not as a reformer. 2 Thess. 1:6-8: 'Recompense . . . taking vengeance.' Divine justice will not be put to shame by human justice, which is likewise vindictive where it is punitive." "Strafe ist in erster Instanz und recht eigentlich und wesentlich Ahndung des Bösen, die Heimzahlung der Schuld auf den Beschuldeten. Dass sich der Bestrafte bessert, ist eine reine Zufälligkeit, die uebrigens in den seltensten Faellen eintritt." (*Proceedings*, Texas Dist., 1907, p. 44.) Luther: "These fearful things will take place when Christ descends from heaven to give battle to His enemies, that is, to take vengeance on the wicked. . . . Es wird ein greulich, unerhoert Wetter sein, desgleichen nicht gewesen ist von Anbeginn der Welt." (VIII:1327, 1330.) (8) The restorationists and annihilationists enlist the principles of the experience-theology in their cause. C. Stange: "Wir haben fuer die ewigen Hoellenstrafen keine *Erfahrungsgrundlage*." (*Op. cit.*, p. 162.) Blumhardt declared that since he himself had experienced the great mercy of God he had to reject the thought of an eternal damnation for others as absurd. (See Oelsner, *op. cit.*, p. 97.) P. Althaus, as quoted above: "Since God chose us and gave us the saving faith, should not our humility give us the assurance that God will treat all the others as He treated us? We dare to entertain the confident hope not only of our salvation but of the final restoration of all." (*Op. cit.*, p. 186.) Since God's love found me and accepted me, who am no better than the others, I am certain that He will accept all. That sounds reasonable and logical. It appeals to our feeling. But Christian experience and human deductions from our experience are not a source of the Christian doctrine. The experience-theology is a form of rationalism. And carnal reason wants its deductions set above God's Word! (9) Carnal reason appeals to the teachings of evolutionism. J. J. Knap raises the charge that some restorationists do that. "Some people are so encased in the theory of

The Origenists are engaged in an evil business. "All their objections are born out of a false principle, out of the assumption that it is right and reasonable to make our human thoughts and considerations the judge of God's nature and work." (Pieper, *op. cit.*, III, p. 612.) And this assumption is born out of the wicked presumption of arrogant reason. Luther: "Nature and reason cannot bear it" (the thought of eternal punishment). "We are forbidden to judge of God's truth by our thoughts and feelings. These thoughts arise out of the ingrained presumption of human nature. . . . The eye of nature must be plucked out; es geht sonst ohne greuliche, gefaehrliche Aergernisse nicht ab." (X:2002 ff.) Reason leads men to commit the monstrous crime of sitting in judgment on God! "Derhalben ihnen zu raten ist, dass sie mit Gottes Gerichten unverworren bleiben." (*Ibid.*) Speaking of the Hades gospel, we said: "One particularly loathsome and wicked feature of rationalism is its arrogant assumption of the right to sit in judgment on God. Carnal reason considers itself as wise as God and dares to condemn God as He has revealed Himself in Scripture. It wants a God of its own making." (CONC. THEOL. MONTHLY, 1945, p. 605.) The apocatastasis gospel commits the same crime.

Another loathsome feature of rationalism is its espousal of Pelagianism. One who takes proud reason for his guide will inevitably, in the end, glorify the innate goodness of man. We are not saying that everyone who denies eternal damnation is a Pelagian; many obey reason on one point, but refuse to follow it all the way. But there are many who are consistent rationalists and advocate restorationism because of their Pelagianism. To them sin is a small matter (see above) and man a noble creature. The Unitarians believe in "the

evolution that they dream of an incessant process whereby mankind gradually climbs from lower to higher development, even from sin to holiness. . . . Even though we do not complete our development in this earthly life, the evolutionist is not disheartened. . . . In that unknown future the progress of development continues, soul life ripens and becomes more capable of living with God. No one is lost. After many ages everything will be all right. . . . This theory is repulsive to any one who fears the Lord." (*Life Beyond the Grave*, p. 169 ff.) P. Althaus raises the same charge. (*Op. cit.*, p. 176 f.) And Storr halfway admits the charge. "Our whole thinking is dominated by the conception of evolution. We no longer believe in . . . an eternal fixity of condition. . . . Our whole outlook on these questions [everlasting damnation] is changed. . . . The evolutionary view of the world reveals a process of advance through struggle." (*Op. cit.*, pp. 209—211.)

essential dignity and perfectibility of human nature." (See above.) Origen, the father of the restorationists, "taught the perpetual freedom of the will and therefore set no time-limits to the capacity for restoration." (See Plumptre, *op. cit.*, p. 135.) *The Winchester Centennial*: "All are worthy of that life; all are capable of it. . . . It carries with it a tremendous faith in man and belief in his capacities. . . . Universalism affirms that man is not a fallen being, a worm, a slave, a wreck, but a developing being who began low down and is on his way up — not a ruin, but a mine full of latent riches. His capacities are great. . . . God is not to be propitiated, but served and loved and enjoyed. . . . Holiness is an achievement of personal character; it exists only in and by personal achievement." (*Op. cit.*, pp. 35, 55, 144, 154.) And so we hear Walter Rauschenbusch declaring: "No man, in any human sense of justice, has deserved an eternity of hell." (See above.) And in *What Is Hell?* Sheila Kaye-Smith tells us: "Today men no longer sue for pardon, but claim immunity." (See *The Presbyterian*, Aug. 28, 1930.) — James D. Smart (Presbyterian): "So reasonable, so sane-minded, have we become that the idea of judgment or of a hell no longer has any place in our thoughts. . . . The idea grows that *everyone has a sufficient spark of good in him* so that God will be able eventually in some way to effect his salvation and bring him to paradise." (*What Man Can Believe*, p. 238. — Pastor Smart continues: "We are even told that any lesser view is incompatible with the love of God. Jesus will hardly be accused of being ignorant of the implications of the love of God, and yet there is no version of His teaching which has come down to us of which judgment and hell are not an integral part.")

### 3

The denial of eternal damnation is a vicious teaching, for "it engenders carnal security and may cause men to be eternally lost." These words were addressed to the preachers of the Hades gospel (*CONC. THEOL. MONTHLY*, 1945, pp. 611—614), who hold out the hope of final salvation to some of the inmates of Hades. They apply with double and tenfold force to the preachers of the apocatastasis gospel, which promises final salvation to all inmates of hell. It dulls the terrible threats of God and lulls the awakened conscience into peaceful,

into fatal sleep. When the conscience of the natural man accuses him of sin and threatens him with the coming Judgment (Rom. 2:14-16), the preachers of the "wider hope" advise him not to take sin so seriously and to rid himself of these old superstitions. And when God sharpens his conscience and tells him: "The wages of sin is death" (Rom. 5:23), and: "He will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire" (Matt. 3:12), and: "He that believeth not shall be damned" (Mark 16:16), and: "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with His mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God and that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ" (2 Thess. 1:7-9), and: "Woe unto them . . . to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness forever" (Jude 13), they tell him: "God does not mean that; yea, hath God said that? Ye shall not surely die.—The natural man and the flesh of the Christian want to be told that he is not so bad and hell is not so bad as the conscience and God's Word says,<sup>10</sup> and they are ready to tell the criminal that his case looks good. The natural man and the flesh of the Christian beg them: "Speak unto us smooth things" (Is. 30:10), and get the consoling answer: "The old evil word 'hell' should be left out of our vocabularies." " 'Damnation'—what a profane word to permit in a modern book." (*Which Way?* pp. 88—89.) And when the Christian preacher speaks of hell, damnation, W. R. Inge cries out: "Lutheranism worships a God who is neither just nor merciful" (See *The Churchman*, Oct. 15, 1944), and John Henry Lehn declares: "Lutherans believe in an infinite monster for a god."<sup>11</sup> Where such things are preached, no man can—unless God in His mercy intervenes—escape eternal damnation.

There are Hades theologians who warn the apocatastasis theologians of the fatal result of their teaching. Gerlach: "Another and worse perversion is the doctrine of the restitu-

<sup>10</sup> J. E. Conant: "Hell is an unspeakable reality! And yet there are always those who refuse to believe in the justice of hell. It is only those, however, in whose hearts there is the spirit of criminals against God's government. And it is a matter of common observation that no criminal is fit to judge of the justice of the law he has broken, for he is always prejudiced in his own favor." (*No Salvation Without Substitution*, p. 98.)

<sup>11</sup> Prof. John Schmidt answered: "The Lutheran Church takes seriously the fact and consequence of sin. And that is why it proclaims so emphatically the blessed Gospel of forgiveness through God's grace." (See *The Christian Century*, March 8, 1944.)



tion of all things, of the ultimate deliverance of the devils and the wicked from hell; Scripture everywhere rejects such a doctrine. . . . Woe unto him who delays his repentance." (*Op. cit.*, p. 565.) Farrar: "If any hardened sinner, shamefully loving his sin and despising the long-suffering of his Savior, *trifle* with that doctrine, it is at his own just and awful peril. . . . I earnestly ask your whole attention while I rede you beware how you wrest God's mercy to your own ruin." (*Op. cit.*, pp. 88, 130.) J. Paterson-Smyth: "A man who presumes recklessly on chances in the future is taking terrible risks." (*The Gospel of the Hereafter*, p. 146.) And the restorationists themselves feel that their doctrine is dangerous. Some of them declare that it must not be preached publicly. And others protest that they, too, are proclaiming the wrath of God against sin; they thereby admit that the sinner needs to be warned. But failing to preach the full wrath of God, they are putting their hearers into the danger of eternal damnation.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>12</sup> "J. A. Bengel believed the doctrine of the apokatastasis, but thought it dangerous to teach." (Schaff-Herzog, s. v. Apokatastasis.) "His biographer said: 'Wer von der Apokatastasis Einsicht hat und sagt es aus, der schwaetzt aus der Schule.'" (See Traub, *op. cit.*, p. 273.) Traub also quotes Samuel Keller: "Some restorationists hold to the present day that it may be taught in the closed circle of advanced Christians, but must not be proclaimed publicly." Some go so far as to assert that God Himself wants this doctrine treated as an esoteric doctrine—Geheimlehre. "They allege that the doctrine of eternal punishment is only *regulative*, and that God has not made plain His purpose to save all men ultimately, because He wishes men to feel the legitimate influence of the doctrine of eternal punishment." (Schaff-Herzog, s. v. Punishment.)—Koeberle says: "We will have to admit that the restorationists never intended to tone down the severity of God's judgments against the sinner." (*Op. cit.*, p. 72.) Well, this is how the Universalist enforces the severity of God's wrath: "Universalism may be taught in such a way as to minimize the heinousness of sin. If all is to be well in the long run, does it matter much what use we make of our present opportunities? But this is to misunderstand the nature of the doctrine which rightly interpreted makes the process of final restoration long and difficult. Chastisement, discipline, purgation will be needed to burn away the dross and leave the pure gold of purified character. The impenitent sinner will only be saved so as by fire.'" (*Op. cit.*, p. 222.) These Universalists claim that they have done their duty by the impenitent by proclaiming at least half an eternity of damnation. And H. E. Fosdick claims that he has sufficiently warned the impenitent by restricting "damnation" to this life. In a sermon published in *The Christian Century*, Dec. 4, 1935, he said: "Modernistic Christianity largely eliminated from its faith the God of moral judgment. To be sure, in the old theology, the God of moral judgment had been terribly presented so that little children did cry themselves to sleep at night for fear of him and of his hell. Modernism, not content with eliminating the excrescences of a harsh theology, became softer yet and created the general impression



The 42d of the *Articles of Religion* reads: "All men shall not be saved at length.— They also are worthy of condemnation who endeavor at this time to restore the dangerous (*periculosum*) opinion that all men, be they never so ungodly, shall at length be saved when they have suffered pains for their sins a certain time appointed by God's justice." It disappeared in the Revision of 1563 (Thirty-Nine Articles). But it spoke the truth. The apocatastasis imperils men's salvation. J. Ruskin said that the denial of hell is the "most dangerous, because the most attractive, form of modern infidelity." (The restorationists do not deny the existence of hell, but they deny its eternity. And such a hell is no longer hell.)

The men who preach this form of unbelief are known as the "merciful" theologians. "*Misericordes doctores*" (Quenstedt), "*nostri misericordes* — our party of pity" (Augustine). They glory in that name. *The Winchester Centennial* speaks of the "Merciful Doctors" of the early Church (p. 40) and Farrar of "these merciful opinions" (*op. cit.*, p. 157). It is, however, not a merciful, but a cruel theology which refuses to warn the sinner of the fatal result of unbelief. It tends to frustrate the merciful design of God to bring all sinners to repentance and thus becomes a contributory cause of the eternal damnation of many. The gospel of the Eternal Hope is a gospel of death.

The merciful theologians are those who denounce eternal damnation against the unbeliever. It is not an easy thing to do that. We, too, would like to preach restorationism, or, at least, annihilationism. Satan and our flesh are raising the disturbing thought that eternal damnation does not accord with the mercy and love of God. But mercilessly we pluck

---

that there is nothing here to fear at all. . . . But there are things here to dread. Ask the physicians. They will tell us that in a law-abiding world are stern conditions whose fulfillment involves bodily destiny. Ask the economists. They will tell us there are things to dread which lead to an inevitable economic hell. Underline this: *Sin is real*. Personal and social sin is as terribly real as our forefathers said it was, no matter how we change their way of saying it. And it leads men and nations to damnation as they said it did, no matter how we change their way of picturing it." "*Which Way?*" takes "the Orthodox world" to task for "suspecting that Ballou's Universalism made light of sin." (P. 45.) To be sure, Ballou taught that sin will be punished in hell — but not eternally, and Fosdick teaches that sin leads to a hell in this life. But thereby these men do minimize the heinousness of sin; they induce men to make light of the earnest warnings of God and lead them into eternal damnation.

out the eye of reason and mercilessly tell the unrepentant sinner of the terrible judgments of God.<sup>13</sup> Mercilessly we suppress our faltering flesh and remind ourselves of the awful doom pronounced by God upon the watchman who, when God says to the wicked: "Thou shalt surely die!" does not give him warning (Ezek. 3:17-20). Men implore us to delete that offensive paragraph out of Article XVII of the Augsburg Confession. We turn a deaf ear to them and refuse to delete out of the Bible the words: "God is angry with the wicked every day. If he turn not, He will whet His sword. He hath bent His bow and made it ready" (Ps. 7:11-12). Mercilessly we tell the secure sinner that he will be judged "without mercy" (James 2:13). And such preaching is dictated by true mercy. In no other way can the sinner be saved from eternal damnation. It is the loving, merciful Savior who warns us of eternal damnation. He teaches this dread truth because He wants to save us, save all men from hell. As often as we read the word "hell" in the Bible, we see God's heart yearning after the salvation of the sinner. "Scripture teaches the dread truth of eternal damnation for the purpose of warning against unbelief of the Gospel, of warning against carnal security, and of saving men from eternal damnation." (Pieper, *op. cit.*, p. 617.)<sup>14</sup>

<sup>13</sup> We know that the light of heaven will show us that everything that God does is in accord with His eternal love. But our carnal reason does not like to wait that long for the solution of the difficulty and would harmonize God's love and God's justice now. Mercilessly we suppress this wicked impatience and say with Luther: "Reason rebels at being kept in ignorance. Satan makes it his business to stir up this dissatisfaction of the flesh, for he knows that it is faith's most noble and precious quality that in this case it closes its eyes and willingly abstains from these investigations. . . . It knows that God is the highest goodness and justice, even though to all appearance, according to reason, sense, and experience, there is nothing but wrath and injustice. Pluck out completely the eye of nature. . . . Do not meddle in God's judgments!" (X:2003.)

<sup>14</sup> Some relevant statements: "There is something in us which is impressed by these arguments (against eternal damnation). But there is that which always keeps us from yielding to them: the fear of God's Word. God's Word speaks differently of this matter than our reason would like to speak of it. And the Holy Ghost, who is in us, who has created faith in the Word and preserves it in us, ever and always grants our faith the victory over our reason and gives us the strength to submit obediently to the teaching of God and to 'cast down imaginations and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God'" (2 Cor. 10:5). (*Proc.*, Texas Dist., 1907, p. 51.) "We cannot give up the doctrine of hell, for it is one of the truths God revealed to us. . . . One who denies hell will in the end deny Christ, who for us was the plagues

It is the sacred duty of the Christian minister to warn against the dangerous doctrine of the apocatastasis — and against any teaching that serves its interest. The Hades gospel does that. We have pointed that out in a preceding article. But now, having taken a close look at restorationism, we are in a position to make a few additional remarks. One detects at once the close family resemblance between the Hades gospel and the apocatastasis gospel. And it becomes clear that they are fighting for a common cause. Both apply the same principles and operate with the same arguments. The only difference is that the Hades people do not apply the common principles as consistently as the restorationists. But they are fighting the battle of the restorationists. The Hades gospel prepares the way for the apocatastasis gospel.

and destruction of hell. He that does not believe in hell cannot believe in Christ; but he that believeth not will be damned. We hold fast to the doctrine of hell. By it we measure the magnitude of our sin. What a terrible thing sin must be, since God punishes it so severely! By it we measure the unspeakable greatness of the love of our Savior. If we would rightly know what our Savior did for us, we need only contemplate hell. Then we will rejoice: 'Thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.' (Ev.-Luth. Gemeindeblatt, 30. Nov., 1930.) John A. W. Haas: "Hell and the Devil. What impossible words these are! . . . Some Lutheran pulpits still preach the whole counsel of God. Is this true of all? But the final question remains, namely, are these doctrines 'morally indefensible'? They do not fit into a morality which has reduced sin to sickness, or has made it merely the weakness of finite beings, or has taken it to be partial righteousness. But such a morality is the destruction of ethical progress. Its minimizing of sin makes the sinner comfortable in his transgression. The awful consequences of sin are forgotten. . . . The modernistic, sociological woman preacher, Maud Royden, has even dared to say that Christ made nothing of sin. The question might be asked: What sort of a New Testament does Miss Royden use? . . . The negation of these doctrines, which are a part of a consistent Christian system of truth, also degrades the love of God. It turns divine love into weak sentimentality. The fact is forgotten that divine love is such just because it is holy. God would not love us for our salvation if He condoned sin. Because He hates sin, and His wrath is upon it, He loves us. The ultimate destiny of punishment for men is not His will, but the consequence . . . of the choice of the evil. This position is the best Christian religion and the best morality. To it we shall be compelled to return after we have sobered up from the modernistic intoxication." (See *The Lutheran*, Jan. 30, 1930.) C. E. Macartney: "One great truth of the Christian revelation, future punishment, perplexes me more than it did in youth. . . . Yet more and more I see that this is an essential doctrine of the Christian faith. I have read the writings of those who speak about the 'larger hope' and who make future retribution a figure of speech, but I must always go back to the fact that it was Jesus Himself, the Savior, who took little children upon His arms and blessed them and who so loved the world as to suffer and die for it, who spoke the most, and the most solemnly, on this." (See *The Christian Century*, March 8, 1939.)

1. The chief argument for the Hades gospel is based on the mercy and justice of God. Traub: "The love and righteousness of God demand that every man get the opportunity to decide for or against Christ, either in this life or after this life." (*Op. cit.*, p. 91.) And the chief argument of the restorationists is that "God is an infinite Father," "that this is a universe of absolute justice" (see above). The restorationists thank the Hades theologians for defending this principle and only deplore that they do not apply it to all men.

2. The Hades theology stresses "the universality of Christ's atonement." (*The Gospel of the Hereafter*, p. 61.) Farrar insists that "the Hades gospel is impregnably built upon the rock of an entire belief in Christ's infinite Redemption." (*Op. cit.*, p. LXV.) The restorationists stress the same "universality of salvation" (see above) and wonder why their allies, the Hades theologians, do not make this "universality" cover all men in hell. — Both groups believe, and strengthen each other in the fixed idea, that "this world's development cannot end in a Dualism."

3. S. Barney-Gould quotes 1 John 3:8, and declares, "Surely, if eight ninths of the men and women born into this world are to perish everlastingly, then Satan would have triumphed, Christ will have failed to destroy his works." (*The Restitution of All Things*, p. 38.) The Universalists say: That is a good point. "Endless hell would be a confession of God's failure. . . . Universalism is faith in the success of God." (See above.)

4. Plumptre declares that "the punishments of God are remedial and reformatory." (*Op. cit.*, pp. 147, 165.) And the restorationists make the most of this, more of it than Plumptre does. "If the punishment of God have a loving and healing purpose, they must continue until that purpose is accomplished and then must cease." (See above.)

5. Farrar's argument for his theory that some will be saved in the hereafter is that "there is no authority whatever for rendering aeonian 'everlasting.'" The Universalists were quick to take over this argument and made the logical deduction that hell will not last forever. (See above.)

6. The Hades theologians have a high regard for Origen. "The noblest, loftiest, most loving teacher of the ancient Church

(I am not afraid to speak thus of Origen) embraced it — that larger hope — almost as the author of his soul." (Plumptre, *op. cit.*, p. 13.) They are willing to follow him half of the way. The restorationists have the same high regard for Origen and follow him all the way.

7. Both the Hades theologians and the apocatastasis theologians make the doctrine of endless damnation responsible for the spread of infidelity. The only difference is that the former hold that the remedy would be to teach that damnation will end for some and the latter, that damnation will end for all.

8. Plumptre holds that "the teaching of the New Testament tends, in not a few passages, to the thought of an universal restoration." (*Op. cit.*, p. 125.) The restorationists insist that the New Testament definitely and expressly teaches it.

9. The fundamental thesis of the Hades gospel "may be summed up in the single sentence — That God's mercy may extend beyond the grave; that, as Fronmueller said, 'the ways of God's salvation do not necessarily terminate with earthly life.'" (Farrar, *op. cit.*, p. XII.) This foundation proved strong enough to bear the whole superstructure of the apocatastasis gospel.

10. The fundamental principle of the Hades theology is rationalism. Plumptre: "Reason rose in rebellion against a dogma that clashed with men's sense of equity." (*Op. cit.*, p. 167.) And every such utterance of the Hades theologians is a valuable contribution to the cause of the restorationists, who have the same fundamental principle and declare that the teaching of endless punishment "sneers at common sense and spits upon reason." — Farrar, who preaches both the Hades gospel and the apocatastasis gospel, declares: "The voice of reason and conscience, rising in revolt against a doctrine which they found irreconcilable with the love of God, still made itself occasionally heard." "It is certain that no argument hitherto adduced on the other side will ever silence the remonstrance of the outraged reason." (*Op. cit.*, LXIII: 172.)<sup>15</sup>

<sup>15</sup> A word on the baffling case of Dr. Farrar. Farrar will have nothing to do with restorationism. "I am unable to adopt the universalist opinion." "For Universalism I have not pleaded." "I cannot preach the certainty of Universalism." "I have never denied the possibility of



The Hades gospel prepares the way for the apocatastasis gospel. Restorationism is simply the extension of the teaching that God's mercy and justice compel Him to offer the un-

endless misery for those who abide in the determined impenitence of final and willing sin." "The statements which have been so freely circulated in England and in America that I 'denied the existence of hell,' or denounced the doctrine of eternal punishment,' are merely ignorant perversions of what I tried to teach." (*Op. cit.*, pp. XIII, XXIX, 84, 184, 227.) But at the same time he declares for restorationism. "Universalism does indeed derive much support from many passages of Scripture; it—or a view more or less analogous to it—was held by Origen, the greatest and noblest, by Gregory of Nyssa, the most fearless, etc." "The Scriptures reveal indeed a future state of retribution, but are—when competently interpreted in the light of modern criticism—absolutely silent as to 'endless torture.'" "We ask men to take nobler and truer views of God than those which run counter to what the Scriptures teach us of His everlasting mercy; of His purpose in punishment being not to torture, but to redeem; of the day when Christ shall have triumphed forever, and God shall be all in all." "What was the teaching of our Blessed Lord,—was it 'turn or burn'? or was it 'Come unto Me and I will give you rest'?" "What a world, we may well exclaim, for the loving and merciful eye of God to contemplate! How frightful a result, in spite of how infinite a sacrifice!" "The soul's transgressions of a few brief hours of struggling, tempted life followed by billions of millenniums in scorching fire. . . . I fling from me with abhorrence such a creed as that." (*Op. cit.*, pp. 61, 84, 113, 119, 121, 155.) *The Theological Quarterly* analyzes the case thus: "It is instructing to note that men like Farrar, e.g., are led by their interpretation of the passages concerned to the very verge of Universalism, only to draw back with a 'God forbid' from the bottomless abyss of dangerous conclusions which they find in that doctrine" (1919, p. 232). Others find that Farrar was a true Universalist and thank him for his universalistic sentiments. *The Winchester Centennial* says, p. 45: "Seventy-four years before Farrar's sermons on 'Eternal Hope,' which have been so widely read and so influential in this country, these men had reached the same broad interpretations which they embody, and were preaching them wherever hearing could be had." *Which Way?* has this to say: "Farrar challenged his critics, who insisted that the same word (*eonian*) must always mean the same thing, to apply that opinion, if they dared to, to the text, 'As in Adam all die, etc.'" "In the popular mind the old evil word 'hell' involves the most dangerous conclusions. Well done, Walter Balfour! Well done, Canon Farrar! Universalists salute you. The New Bible for the New Age admits your noble contention that the word 'hell' has outlived its usefulness if it ever had any, and should now be forever dismissed from human speech." (*Op. cit.*, pp. 88, 101.) Professor E. B. Pusey makes the same diagnosis: "Dr. Farrar's belief is happily better than that of his book. In his book unhappily he contented himself with stating that he was not a Universalist, while he did not observe that all the arguments which he used were Universalist, extending even to what he intended to exclude from his consideration, the restoration of Satan. The book, until it is withdrawn, notwithstanding its author's declaration of his personal belief, must remain, as it is, an inconsistent impassioned pleading for 'Universalism.' It must, as far as it has influence, teach the Universalism which its writer does not believe." (*Op. cit.*, p. V.) — But is Dr. Farrar's case really so baffling? The Hades theologians, if they really believe in their principles and arguments, cannot but harbor in their hearts, consciously or unconsciously, Universalist thoughts, and some cannot keep themselves from expressing them.

believer another chance in Hades, the *status intermedius*; it teaches "a *status intermedius* between bliss and damnation that continues in *eternity*." (Hoenecke, *op. cit.*, IV, p. 226.) "Die Lehre von der Wiederbringung aller Dinge ist der Grundgedanke oder doch die notwendige Konsequenz der schriftwidrigen Behauptung, als habe Christus in der Hoelle Evangelium gepredigt" (*Lehre und Wehre*, 1874, p. 83). The Hades theologians will have great difficulty to find a satisfactory answer to the question which a friend asked Dr. Plumptre: "Let me ask, then, will it be possible to extend the period of probation of any man beyond this life without extending it to all? . . . If there is a probation for any, it must extend to all." (*Op. cit.*, pp. 345—346.) It is a miracle of divine grace when a Hades theologian refuses to preach the apocatastasis gospel.

Left to the compelling force of his reasoning and the urging of his flesh, he will promise ultimate salvation to all. And even if he does not, his hearers will, unless the grace of God intervenes, draw the logical Universalist conclusion. He may warn his hearers against restorationism, but Satan will tell them: Your preacher has assured you that divine mercy awaits some who died in unbelief; be of good cheer, the mercy of God is even greater — it extends over all who died in unbelief. — It is the sacred duty of the Christian minister to warn against the dangerous doctrine of the apocatastasis and of the Hades gospel which leads to it, aids and abets it. The language used by W. Floerke in condemning the Hades gospel is not too strong: "Diese Lehre, dass die Gnadenzeit keineswegs zu Ende ist mit diesem Leben, dass noch jenseits des Todes die Heilspredigt schallt und die Umkehr moeglich ist . . . das ist die schlimmste, gottloseste Revolution, die es nur geben kann, und wer seine Kirche noch liebhat, muss dagegen Protest erheben, so laut er kann." (See *Lehre und Wehre*, 1865, p. 27.) The Hades gospel itself creates false hopes and is responsible for the carnal security engendered by the apocatastasis gospel.

The merciful Savior requires His ministers to denounce eternal damnation against the sinner, so that he may throw himself upon the mercy of the Savior. "The Church has pressed upon us, Lent by Lent, that 'it is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God,' and 'the terrible voice

of most just judgment which shall be pronounced upon' impenitent sinners, 'when it shall be said unto them, "Depart from Me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels"'; has taught us week by week to pray, 'From Thy wrath and from everlasting damnation, Good Lord, deliver us'; and, in the sight of death, put into our mouths the piercing cry, 'O holy and most merciful Savior, deliver us not into the bitter pains of eternal death.'" (E. B. Pusey, *op. cit.*, p. IX.) Luther: "Let us take this sincere warning and kind admonition of our gracious God and dear Father to heart and say: I know, dear God, that Thou art concerned about my salvation; I will, then, turn to Thee in true repentance, never forget about the last trumpet, and daily look for Thy coming to judgment. . . . Our dear Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, grant us His Holy Spirit, that we may, in true faith and in a godly life, look for and hasten to the coming of His day, when we shall be caught up in the resurrection of the dead with the elect and blessed, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord." (VIII: 1333, 1335.)

---

## Luther and the War Against the Turks

By GEORGE W. FORELL,\* New York City

Modern psychoanalysis tells us that disease is the touchstone of the healthy mind. What is true in the realm of psychology is not less true in the realm of ethics. The most terrible disease in the realm of human relations is war, and so we can say that war is the touchstone of a healthy ethical system. In its attitude toward war the weakness of an ethical system is revealed. In the war situation an ethical system is revealed as basically unrealistic if it proves unwilling to face the actual situation and therefore uses the escape of absolute pacifism. It is revealed as basically immoral if it condones any war to such an extent that it loses sight of sin and injustice and makes of that war a holy war or a crusade.

Because the attitude toward war growing out of an ethical system has a peculiar significance, it is of considerable value

---

\* This article originally appeared in *Church History*. It is here reprinted by permission. — Ed. Note.

to study Luther's attitude toward the war against the Turks. His attitude as expressed here will throw some light upon his theological presuppositions and will serve to illustrate his ethical system.

However, little has been written in regard to Luther's position in the war against the Turks. There are few studies of the subject and not one in English.<sup>1</sup> Yet the war against the Turks formed the colorful background of the Reformation.

In the early years of the Reformation, the Turkish danger had constantly increased. Large parts of southeastern Europe were under Turkish rule. After the sudden death of Selim I, in 1520, Suleiman II became his successor. Some had hoped that he would rest on the laurels of his predecessor, but such hopes failed to materialize. On the contrary, while Selim I had fought his major battles against Egypt in Africa, Suleiman had his hands free to attack Hungary, the southeastern bulwark of Christendom. In 1521 he captured Belgrade, and in the battle of Mohacz in 1526 he routed the Hungarian army. King Louis II was killed, and all Europe lay open to the victorious armies of the Moslems.

Ferdinand of Austria suddenly realized that his country was the next objective of the advancing enemy. He tried to appease the Sultan with diplomacy. Sending ambassadors to the Turks, he offered peace and a "good neighbor policy." But the ambassadors returned with the disquieting message that Suleiman expected to discuss the matter personally with Archduke of Austria — and in Vienna.

Small wonder that not only Austria but Christian Europe in general was terror-stricken. It was at that time that Luther published his first major statement in regard to the Turkish danger. It appeared in 1529 under the title *On War Against the Turk*, and was written to counteract the prevalent opinion that Luther considered the war against the Turks a war against God. This impression of Luther's position had been fostered by the notorious papal bull *Exsurge Domine*, in which Pope Leo X had condemned Luther's theses as heretical. In his fifth thesis Luther had said that the Pope cannot remit any other punishments than those which he or canon law

---

<sup>1</sup> During the recent war a German, Helmut Lamparter, has examined Luther's position in the war against the Turks. He is especially interested to prove Luther's absolute disavowal of military crusades. Cf. H. Lamparter, *Luthers Stellung zum Tuerkenkrieg* (Muenchen, 1940).

had imposed.<sup>2</sup> He had claimed that the Pope cannot remit God's punishments. And in his defense of the Ninety-five Theses, of 1518, he had tried to make his point even more emphatic and had added that if the Pope was as well able to remit divine punishment as he claimed, he should stop the advance of the Turk. Luther said that he must indeed be a poor Christian who does not know that the Turks are a punishment from God, and invited the Pope to stop that punishment.<sup>3</sup>

The Pope had countered by condemning as heretical the following sentence of Luther: "To fight against the Turks is to fight against God's visitation upon our iniquities."<sup>4</sup> In this misleading form Luther's attitude toward the war against the Turks had been widely publicized. This had given the general impression that Luther considered a war against the Turks sinful and preferred the rule of the Turks to the rule of the Emperor.

Luther had to answer this accusation. He did that in a detailed reassertion of all the articles condemned by Leo X.<sup>5</sup> In regard to the Turks he said that unless the Pope were put in his place, all attempts to defeat the Turks would prove futile. The wrath of the Lord would continue to be upon all Christendom as long as Christian nations continued to honor those most Turkish of all Turks, even the Romanists.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>2</sup> *Luthers Werke*, Weimar ed., I, 233, 18: "5. Papa non vult nec potest ullas penas remittere nisi eas, quas arbitrio vel suo vel canonum imposuit." All quotations from Luther's works are from the Weimar edition.

<sup>3</sup> *Luthers Werke*, I, 535, 30: "Alioqui si sacerdos ecclesiae sive summus sive infimus potest hanc poenam potestate clavium solvere: pellat ergo pestes, bella, seditiones, terremotus, incendia, caedes, latrocinia, item Turcas et Tartaros aliosque infideles, quos esse flagella et virgam dei nemo nisi parum christianus ignorat. Dicit enim Isa. X Ve Assur! virga furoris mei et baculus ipse est. In manu eius indignatio mea. Licet plurimi nunc et eidem magni in ecclesia nihil aliud somnient quam bella adversus Turcam, scilicet non contra iniquitates, sed contra virgam iniquitatis bellaturi deoque repugnaturi, qui per eam virgam sese visitare dicit iniquitates nostras, eo quod nos non visitamus eas."

<sup>4</sup> *Bulla Exsurge Domine*, June 15, 1520: "Proeliari adversus Turcas est repugnare Dei visitanti iniquitates nostras."

<sup>5</sup> *Luthers Werke*, VII, 94ff.: *Assertio omnium articulorum M. Lutheri per Bullam Leonis X novissimam damnatorum.*

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, VII, 141, 24: "Qui habet aures audiendi, audiat et Bello Turchico absteineat, donec Papae nomen sub caelo valet."

Also VII, 141, 7: "Et iis omnibus non est aversus furor domini, nec dum intelligimus manum dei, percutientis nos in corpore et anima per hos Romanos Turcissimos Turcas."



But this answer merely showed that Luther's pronouncements in regard to the Turks were not a defense of the Turks but an attack against the Pope. It had not clarified his own attitude toward the increasing Turkish danger. Luther did not want the Pope to lead Christendom in a war against the Sultan, but did that mean that he felt that such a war in itself should not be waged? Such an attitude was not uncommon.<sup>7</sup> Was it also Luther's attitude?

Realizing the importance of Luther's position in this matter, friends had urged him for years to write somewhat extensively on the subject. Finally, in January of 1529, he published the above-mentioned book *On War Against the Turk*.<sup>8</sup> It could not have appeared at a more opportune moment. On October 9, 1528, Luther had written the introduction to the book and dedicated it to Philip, Landgrave of Hesse. Here he wrote the almost prophetic words "and now that the Turk is actually approaching." It was not half a year later, in May, 1529, that Suleiman actually left Constantinople. In the autumn of the same year the Turkish army reached the outskirts of Vienna and encircled the city. It seemed that Vienna was doomed. Luther heard of the siege of Vienna on his way home from the Marburg Colloquy. It was in Marburg that his attention had been called by Myconius to certain sayings of a Franciscan monk. This man, Johannes Hilten, had predicted the Turkish danger on the basis of certain prophecies in the book of Daniel.<sup>9</sup> Luther was impressed and worried. He now began to believe that the book of Daniel might throw some light on the contemporary trials of Christendom. It was under the impact of this information and of the siege of Vienna that he decided to write another book dealing with the Turkish danger. Before this plan could be executed, Luther heard with relief that Suleiman and his army had retreated from Vienna. Yet he felt that the repetition of a Moslem advance had to be avoided. In order to do his part in calling the attention of

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, Briefe, V, 175, 7; No. 1492. Luther to Probst: "*Germania plena est proditoribus, qui Turcas favent.*"

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, XXX, 2, 107. "Vom Kriege widder die Tuercken"; cf. "On War Against the Turk," Philadelphia edition, V.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, Briefe, V, 191; No. 1501. Friedrich Myconius to Luther.

all people to the Turkish danger, he wrote his *Call to War Against the Turk*.<sup>10</sup>

Besides these three major works, there are numerous references to the war against the Turks all through Luther's writings.<sup>11</sup> He was so concerned with the Turkish problem that in 1530 he wrote a preface to a little book by a Dominican monk who had spent more than twenty years in a Turkish prison. This book dealt with the religion and customs of the Moslems and was Luther's main source of information on the subject.<sup>12</sup>

All these writings of Luther indicate quite clearly his grave concern with the danger that threatened Christianity from the Moslem world. More than most of his contemporaries Luther realized what was involved in a war or in pacifistic nonresistance against the Turks.

This is the more remarkable in the light of the actual historical situation. Instead of fearing the Turks, Luther had every reason to be grateful to them. It was the constant danger of a Turkish invasion that had kept the emperor from taking severe measures against Luther's reformation. The Empire needed the help of the Evangelical princes in the war against the Turks and therefore had to postpone its plans to destroy Luther. From the point of view of realistic power politics, the safety of the Reformation depended upon the strength of the Turkish armies. From many points of view the Sultan and Luther might have been political allies.

That Luther was aware of this fact is best illustrated by a little episode reported in the *Table Talk*. At one time Luther was informed by a member of an imperial mission to the Turkish Sultan that Suleiman had been very much interested in Luther and his movement and had asked the ambassadors Luther's age. When they had told him that Luther was forty-eight years old, he had said, "I wish he were even younger; he would find in me a gracious protector." But hearing that report, Luther, not being a realistic politician, made the sign of the cross and said, "May God protect me from such a gracious protector."<sup>13</sup>

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, XXX, 2, 160. Eine Heerpredigt widder den Tuercken.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, LI, 577ff. Vermahnung zum Gebet widder den Tuercken.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, XXX, 2, 205. Vorwort zu dem *Libellus de ritu et moribus Turcorum*.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, T. II, 508, 17: "Egregius quidam vir nomine Schmaltz Hagenensis civis, qui fuit in legatione ad Turcam, Luthero retulit Turcarum

Although by all rules of strategy and power politics Luther and the Turks should have been allies, Luther urged war against the Turks. What was the reason?

### I. THE DANGER

Luther's position concerning the Turks was determined by study of the Bible. It was Luther's intention to instruct the consciences of Christians on the basis of a study of Scripture. He wanted them to learn "what we must know about the Turk and who he is according to Scripture."<sup>14</sup> According to Scripture, the Turks were dangerous. Luther's attitude was not based upon political speculation in regard to a balance of powers. It was not based upon his desire to preserve a so-called Christian civilization. He thought very little of the Christian civilization of his time. Luther's position in regard to the Turks was the result of a thorough study of Scripture and especially of those passages that seemed to point to the Turkish danger. Before Luther spoke about the Turks, he had first obediently listened to the Word of God.

What was the message of Scripture in regard to the Turks? First of all, they were the rod of punishment that God was sending. In his explanation and defense of the Ninety-five Theses, Luther had called the Turk the rod of punishment of the wrath of God. He had said that by means of the Turks, God was punishing Christendom for its contempt of the Gospel. Pope Leo and his courtiers had tried to use this statement to imply that Luther lacked patriotism and claimed divine sanction for the Turkish sword. In spite of this misrepresentation, Luther repeated in 1529 what he had said before: "Because Germany is so full of evil and blasphemy, nothing else can be expected. We must suffer punishment if we do not repent and stop the persecution of the Gospel."<sup>15</sup>

*regem ipsum interrogasse de Martino Luthero, et quot annorum esset; qui cum eum annorum 48 aetatis esse dixisset, respondisse fertur: ich wolt, dass er noch junger were, dann er solt einen gnedigen herrn an mir wissen. Respondit Martinus Lutherus facto crucis signo: Behut mich Gott vor diesem gnedigen herrn."*

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, XXX, 2, 161, 31: "Das gewissen zu unterrichten dienet wol zur sachen, das man gewis sey, was der Tuercke sey und wofuer er zurhalten sey nach der schrift."

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, XXX, 2, 180, 19: "Denn ich hab droben gesagt, weil Deuschland so vol bosheit und Lesterung ist, das zu hoch uber macht ist und yn hymel schreyet, kans nicht anders werden, wo wir uns nicht bessern und ablassen von verfolgung und lesterung des Euangelij, wir muessen herhalten und eine staupe leiden."

And he reiterated that as long as the Christian world refuses to repent, it will not be successful in its wars, for the Lord fights against it.<sup>16</sup> Here Luther stood courageously in the prophetic tradition. With the Prophets, he realized that God can and does use heathen nations in order to punish the so-called Christian nations for their unfaithfulness.

But Luther looked at the Turks from still another point of view. For him they were not only the rod of punishment of the wrath of God, but also the servants and saints of the devil.<sup>17</sup> What did he mean by that? This combination of the rod of punishment of the wrath of God with the servants and saints of the devil throws some light upon Luther's peculiar conception of the devil. For Luther the devil was always God's devil, i. e., in his attempt to counteract God he ultimately serves God. The Turks were the servants and saints of the devil. Why did Luther call them saints?

Luther had read a number of books concerning Mohammedanism, and he was aware of the fact that in many respects the Mohammedans lived a morally upright life. Luther thought that compared with the sincerity of Moslem life and Moslem asceticism, the Roman asceticism seemed ridiculous. And in this context he reminded his readers that "the devil also can make a sour face and fast and perform false miracles and present his servants with mystical raptures."<sup>18</sup> Such practices and experiences are the common property of all religions; they do not demonstrate a religion as true. Even the devil's own religion can be accompanied by such experiences and practices. In this sense the Turks are the saints and servants of the devil; their religious exercises

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., XLVI, 609, 2; cf. W. A. LI, 594, 29: "Wollen wir uns nu lassen helfen und raten, So lasst uns Busse thun und die boesen Stueck so droben erzelet bessern. Werden wir aber solches nicht thun, und wollen uns nicht lassen raten, so ist uns auch nicht zu helfen. Und wird vergeblich sein das wir viel schreien der Tuercke sey ein grausamer Tyran. Denn es hilft nichts, das ein boese Kind schreiet uber die scharffe Ruten, Wo es fromm were, so were die Ruten nicht scharff, ja, sie were kein Rute."

<sup>17</sup> For this division cf. H. Lamparter, *Luthers Stellung zum Tuerkenkrieg*; *Luthers Werke*, LI, 617: "Denn der Tuercken heer ist eigentlich der Teuffel heer." Ibid., XXX, 2, 187: "Unter andern ergebnissen bey den Tuercken ist wol das fuernemste das yre priester odder geistlichen solch ein ernst, dapfer, strenge leben fueren, das man sie moecht fuer Engel und nicht fuer menschen ansehen, das mit allen unsern geistlichen und moenchen ym Bapsttum ein schertz ist gegen sie."

<sup>18</sup> *Luthers Werke*, XXX, 2, 187, 10.

do not disprove it but rather prove it. Luther wanted all soldiers who had to fight the Turks to know their peculiar relationship to the powers of evil. He said: "If you go to war against the Turks, you can be sure that you are not fighting flesh and blood, i. e., against men, for the army of the Turks is actually the army of the devil."<sup>19</sup>

The Turk's peculiar relationship to the realm of the devil explained for Luther the renewed vigor of the Moslem armies at the time of the Reformation. He felt that the devil was worried that the rediscovery of the Gospel might endanger his empire and therefore made these powerful attempts to conquer all Europe.

As saints of the devil the Turks were also destroyers of Christian faith and morals. The worth of their religion could not be measured by their religious exercises or their more or less moral legislation. Luther knew only one criterion by which all religion, and therefore also Mohammedanism, had to be judged. His all-important criterion for the truth of religion was its attitude toward Jesus Christ as the Son of God.<sup>20</sup> He applied this criterion to Mohammedanism and found it wanting.

Luther realized that measured by a purely moralistic standard, the religion of the Turks would come out fairly well. However, he considered such a criterion invalid. Only the faith expressed in the second article of the Apostles' Creed is a valid standard for the truth of religion. Luther had declared in the Smalcald articles: "From this article one cannot depart or give in, even if heaven and earth should fall. . . . And upon this article rests everything that we teach and live against Pope, devil, and the world. Therefore we must be absolutely certain and never doubt; otherwise everything is lost and Pope and devil and all our other enemies will be victorious."<sup>21</sup> Now he claimed against the Turkish religion: "Everything depends upon this second article; because of it we are called Christians and through the Gospel we have

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, LI, 617, 26.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, XXX, 2, 186, 15: "Und durch diesen artickel wird unser glaube gesondert von allen andern glauben auff erden, Denn die Jueden haben das nicht, die Tuercken und Sarracener auch nicht, dazu kein Papist noch falscher Christ noch kein ander ungleubiger, sondern allein die rechten Christen."

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, L, 199, 22.



been called to it and baptized upon it and have been counted as Christians. And through it we receive the Holy Spirit and forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the dead, and eternal life. For this article makes us children of God and brothers of Christ, so that we may become eternally like Him and be His coheirs."<sup>22</sup> The second article of the Apostles' Creed judges all religion. It is the only valid criterion for Christians. It must be considered in judging the religion of the Turks and is far more important than any possible religious habits and experiences associated with Turkish religion. From this position Luther came to the conclusion that the Koran is a "foul book of blasphemy," "merely human reason, and without the Word of God and His Spirit."<sup>23</sup> Its teachings are collected together from Jewish, Christian, and heathen beliefs.<sup>24</sup> And since Mohammed denies that Christ is the Son of God and the Savior of the world, he must be considered an enemy and destroyer of the Lord Jesus and His kingdom. "For he who denies these parts of the Christian faith, namely, that Christ is the Son of God and that He died for us and lives now and rules at the right hand of the Father, what has he to do with Christ? Then Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, Baptism, Sacrament, Gospel, faith, and Christian doctrine and life are destroyed."<sup>25</sup> Because of his denial of the deity of Jesus Christ the Turk is the destroyer and enemy of the Christian faith.

But the Turks are also destroyers of Christian morals. In spite of all their ascetic rules and religious practices Luther considered them murderers<sup>26</sup> and whoremongers.<sup>27</sup> The

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, XXX, 2, 186, 8.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, XXX, 2, 121, 30: "*Ich habe des Mahomets Alkoran etlich stueck, welchs auff deudsch moech predigt — oder lerebuch heissen, wie des Bapsts Decretal heist. Hab ich zeit so mus ichs ia verdeutschen, auf das yderman sehe welch ein faul schendlich buch es ist.*" Also XXX, 2, 168, 15: "... *das ist des Mahomeths Alkoran odder gesetz damit er regirt, In welchem gesetz ist kein goettlich auge, sondern eitel menschliche vernunft on Gottes word und geist.*"

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, XXX, 2, 122, 29: "*Also ists ein glaube zu samen geflickt aus der Juden, Christen und Heiden glauben.*"

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, XXX, 2, 122, 16.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, XXX, 2, 126, 10: "*Weil denn nu des Mahometh Alkoran so ein manchefeltiger luegen geist ist, das er schier nichts lest bleiben der Christlichen wahrheit: wie sollt es anders folgen und ergehen, denn das er auch ein grosser mechtiger moerder wuerde und alle beides unter dem schein der warheit und gerechtigkeit?*"

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, XXX, 2, 126, 21: "*Das dritte stuecke ist, das des Mahomeths Alkoran den Ehestand nicht acht, sondern yderman zu gibt weiber*

Turk does not fight wars from necessity or to protect his land. Like a highwayman, he seeks to rob and damage other lands whose people are doing and have done nothing to him. This he does because according to his religion it is a good work to attack and murder "unbelievers." Held in highest esteem are those Turks who are most diligent in increasing the Turkish kingdom through murder and robbery.

Furthermore, the Turk is the enemy of the institution of marriage. Luther knew that it was customary among the Turks for a man to have any number of wives. He had heard that Moslems bought and sold women like cattle. This made the Turks whoremongers and was contrary to all true Christian morality.

Luther saw in the Turks the punishment of God and the servants and saints of the devil. He discerned their odd combination of purity and depravity. He found them possessed by a spirit of lies and of murder. All this could lead Luther to only one conclusion: the Turk is the Antichrist.

Luthers' identification of the Turk with the Antichrist sounds confusing in view of his frequent claims that it is the Pope in Rome who is the real Antichrist. But for Luther two Antichrists presented no problem. He said: "The person of the Antichrist is at the same time the Pope and the Turk. Every person consists of a body and a soul. So the spirit of the Antichrist is the Pope, his flesh is the Turk. The one has infested the Church spiritually, the other bodily. However, both come from the same lord, even the devil."<sup>28</sup> This conclusion determined Luther's recommendations for the defense against this enemy.

## II. THE DEFENSE

It is not sufficient to state that Luther saw the danger that threatened Europe because of the advance of the Turks. He also realized that he had to suggest means for the defense of Christendom against the approaching danger. It would not have been very helpful if Luther had been satisfied merely to point out the evil confronting Christendom without adding suggestions for its removal. What could be done in the

---

zu nemen wie viel er wil. Und widderumb verlest und verkeufft welche er wil, das die weiber aus der massen unwerd und veracht ynn der Tuerkey sind, werden gekauft und verkauft wie das viehe."

<sup>28</sup> Ibid., T. III, 158, 31.

face of such a great peril? What was the duty of the Christian man in regard to the Turkish danger?

As usual, Luther separated the duties of a man as a Christian from the duties of a man as a citizen. He felt that as Christians all people were called to repentance and prayer. Luther was aware of the guilt of the so-called Christian nations. He knew also that sin and guilt were not limited to the German territories under the rule of Rome and of Roman Catholic princes. They were guilty of grave sins, for they had persecuted the Word of God openly.<sup>29</sup> But the Evangelicals also had lacked the necessary respect for the Word of God. Often they had used it to serve their own lusts and desires.<sup>30</sup> Therefore, both Romans and Evangelicals had deserved the punishment of God.

In his *Call to Prayer Against the Turk* Luther went into detail, enumerating the manifold sins and transgressions of the so-called Christian nations. It was because of this general depravity that one should not be surprised that God had sent the Turks to punish Germany. Luther felt that Germany received her deserts. In order, therefore, to assure a successful defense against the Turk it was necessary for all to

<sup>29</sup> Ibid., LI, 585, 13: "Man spricht, Wem nicht zu raten ist, dem ist nicht zu helfen. Wir Deudschen haben nu vil jar her das liebe wort Gottes gehoert Da durch uns Gott der Vater alle barmhertzigkeit erleuchtet und von den grewlichen greweln der Bepstlichen finsternis und Abgoetterey geruffen in sein heiliges liecht und Reich. Aber wie danckbarlich und ehrlich wir das haben angenommen und gehalten ist schrecklich gnug zu sehen noch heutigen tages. Denn gerade als weren der vorigen Suende zu wenig da wir Gott mit Messen, Fegfeuer, Heiligen-dienst und andere mehr eigen Wercken und gerechtigkeit auff's hoechst (wie wol unwissend) erzuernet und alle winkel mit solchen grossen Abgoettereien erfüellet haben, und gemeinet, Gott darin sonderlich zu dienen, So faren wir darueber zu und verfolgen das liebe wort, so uns zur Busse von solchen greweln berufft, und verteidigen wissentlich und mutwilliglich solche Abgoetterey mit Fewr, Wasser, Strick, Schwert, Fluechen und lestern, das nicht wunder were, ob Gott nicht allein Tuerken, sondern eitel Teuffel uber Deutschland liesse oder lengst hette lassen schwemmen."

<sup>30</sup> Ibid., LI, 586, 29: "Über das auff diesem teil wir, so das Evangelion angenommen und sich des worts rhuemen, erfüllen auch den spruch Rom. 2: 'Gottes Namen wird durch euch unter den Heiden gelestert'. Denn ausgenommen gar wenig, die es mit ernst meinen und dankbarlich annemen, So ist der andere hauffe so undanckbar, so mutwillig, so frech, und leben nicht anders, denn als hette Gott sein Wort darumb uns gegeben, und vom Bapstum sampt seinem Teuffelischen gefengnis erloeset, das wir moechten frey thun und lassen, was uns ge-luestet, Und also sein Wort nicht zu seinen ehren und unser seligkeit, sondern zu unserm mitwillen dienen muesste, So es doch seines lieben Sons Jhesu Christi unsers Herrn und Heilands, blut und tod gekostet hat, das uns solchs so reichlich gepredigt wuerde."

repent and to acknowledge their transgressions. Luther said, "This struggle has to be started with repentance, and we have to change our very being, otherwise we shall fight in vain."<sup>31</sup> And later: "If we want to receive help and counsel, we must first of all repent and change all the evil practices which I mentioned above. Princes and lords must preserve law and do justice, bring an end to money lending, and stop the greed of noblemen, burghers and peasants — but most of all honor the Word of God and care for the schools and churches and their ministers and teachers."<sup>32</sup>

Luther felt that the people needed to learn that only through faithful prayer could the Turkish danger be banished. He said, "Pray ye, because our hope rests not in weapons but in God. If anyone is able to defeat the Turk, it will be the poor little children praying the Lord's Prayer."<sup>33</sup>

But just as repentance and prayer are the tasks of all men as Christians, so these same Christian men have an additional task as citizens. And here again Luther presented the task of the Christian from two different aspects.<sup>34</sup> The Christian as ruler has the duty to resist the Turks.

After the amazing victories of the Turkish armies, many voices could be heard all over Germany proclaiming that the time for fighting the enemy had passed and that the time for appeasing him had come. What's the difference? they said, Germany is doomed; Mohammedanism is the wave of the future. Resistance is hopeless. Many people were resigned to become subjects of the Sultan. Some even hoped for an improvement of their position once the Turks should take over. Against these appeasers Luther said: "We must not despair. For just as God does not want us to be blown up in our conceited self-confidence, He does not want us to give up in despair."<sup>35</sup> Luther made it quite plain that it would

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, XXX, 2, 117, 21.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, LI, 594, 12.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, T. V., 127, 1.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Lamparter, *Luthers Stellung zum Tuerkenkrieg*, 68ff.

<sup>35</sup> *Luthers Werke*, LI, 593, 20: "Hie sprichstu: Was sollen wir denn thun? Sollen wir verzweiveln, hende und fuesse gehen lassen, und dem Tuercken alles einreumen on allen widerstand und gegenwehre? Nein, bey leibe, Des habe ich keinen befelh zu raten, Sonerlich nicht, das man verzagen oder verzweivelen solle, denn gleich wie Gott nicht kan leiden den frechen frevel und mutwillen, davon ich droben gesagt, Also wil er auch nicht, das man verzagen oder verzweivelen solle."

show utter irresponsibility if the Emperor and the princes should give in to the Turk without a fight. It is the task of the princes and rulers to protect their citizens against all enemies. That is the reason that God has given them power. If they fail in their task, they sin against God.<sup>36</sup>

But the duty to fight the Turks in defense of Germany and Europe does not mean that the war against the Turk is a crusade or a holy war. Luther knew the desires of the Papacy to promote crusades. But he considered the very idea of a crusade utter blasphemy. The champions of crusades always implied that they were defending Christ against the devil. The spirit of the crusade was therefore a spirit of pride. Luther considered such a spirit contrary to Christ's spirit of humility and love. The war against the Turks could never be called a crusade of Christians against the enemies of Christ. Luther said: "Such a view is opposed to Christ's teaching and name. It is against His teachings since He said that Christians should not resist evil, should not quarrel and fight and should never seek revenge. It is against His name since in such an army there are hardly five real Christians and perhaps many people worse in the sight of God than the Turks. Yet they all want to go by the name of Christians. This is the worst of all sins, a sin that no Turk commits. For here Christ's name is used for sin and unrighteousness."<sup>37</sup>

Luther ridiculed the idea that the Emperor had to fight a war against the Turks as a protector of the Christian faith and the Christian Church. Only stupid pride and conceit could possibly produce such an idea. Luther said quite plainly, "The Emperor is not the head of Christendom or the defender of the Gospel and of faith. The Christian Church and the Christian faith need a far different protector than an emperor or a king. These men are generally the worst enemies of Christianity and of faith."<sup>38</sup>

Indeed, Luther said, we would be in a serious predicament if the Christian Church had no other protector than some

<sup>36</sup> Ibid., XXX, 2, 129, 17: "*Der ander man so widder den Turcken zu streiten gebuert, ist Keyser Karol (odder wer der Keyser ist). Denn der Turcke greiffet seine unterthanen und sein Keysertum an, welcher schuldig ist die seinen zu verteidigen als eine ordentliche Obrigkeit von Gott gesetzt.*"

<sup>37</sup> Ibid., XXX, 2, 111, 13.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid., XXX, 2, 130, 27.



worldly prince. No prince is sure of his own life for the space of even one hour. Therefore Luther considered the idea of a human defender of the faith an utterly stupid perversion of the truth. He said: "Here you can see how a poor mortal, a future victim of worms, like the Emperor, who is not sure of his life for even one moment, glorifies himself as the true protector of the Christian faith. Scripture says that Christian faith is a rock, too solid to be overthrown by the might of the devil, by death and all powers, that this faith is a divine power (Rom. 1:16). Such a power should be protected by a child of death who can be put to death by any kind of disease? Help us God, the world is crazy. . . . Well, soon we shall have a king or prince who will protect Christ and then somebody else will protect the Holy Ghost, and then of course, the Holy Trinity and Christ and faith will be in a fine shape!"<sup>39</sup>

It is not the task of the princes and of the Emperor to play the defender of the Holy Trinity and of the Christian faith, but it is their task to see to it that their subjects are safe from attack. The Emperor is not the protector of the Church and of the faith, but he is the protector of Germany and of its freedom. Let Him be satisfied with that and do his duty.

Now what of the duty of the subjects in the war against the Turks?<sup>40</sup> First of all, as citizens, they owe obedience to their rulers. They must help the ruler in his task of preserving law and order. Luther had explained before his position in regard to the powers that be. He had spoken of the duty of the citizen as soldier and assured his followers that the professional soldier could also be saved. But now he warned even the subject against participation in a crusade. He said: "If I were a soldier and should see as the flag of my army the colors of a cleric or a cross, even if it were a crucifix, I would run away as if the very devil himself were after me."<sup>41</sup> Luther felt that what was true for the rulers was no less true for the world. Crusades were not only useless but actually blasphemous. No Christian could possibly participate in a crusade. And in this connection Luther added

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, XV, 278, 1.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. Lamparter, *Luthers Stellung zum Tuerkenkrieg*, 97 ff.

<sup>41</sup> *Luthers Werke*, XXX, 2, 115, 1.

that no one who serves as a soldier under an emperor or prince should ever let himself be used in a war against the Gospel, fought under the guise of a crusade but actually persecuting Christians. There is a limit to the obedience which the subject owes to the established order.

However, the soldier who fights for law and order and is a Christian can rest assured of his salvation.<sup>42</sup> The fact that he is a soldier does not exclude him from Christ, as some of the enthusiasts had held. For this soldier does not fight for his own pleasure but in the service of the ordinances of God. If he is aware of this fact, no one can harm him. Then the fear of death is overcome. If such a soldier dies, believing in Christ, then his death on the battlefield is merely the beginning of his eternal life. And Luther considered such a death on the battlefield preferable to the slow death on the sickbed.<sup>43</sup>

If war is fought in defense of law and order and of home and family, then a Christian ought to go to war unafraid. Luther said that the war against the Turks is not our business as Christians but it is very much our business as citizens. A Christian citizen we must face all dangers without flinching, for as Christians we know, "And who is he that will harm you if ye be followers of that which is good?"<sup>44</sup>

Luther's attitude toward the war against the Turks is an integral part of his entire theology. It is especially important because of his persistent denial of the right to proclaim a

<sup>42</sup> Ibid., XXX, 2, 180, 7: "Denn der Tuerck ist ein feind und Tyrann nicht allein widder Christum, sondern auch widder den Keiser und unser oeberkeit. Foddert sie nu die oeberkeit, sollen sie ziehen und drein schmeissen wie gehorsam unterthanen. Werden sie darueber erschlagen, Wolan so sind sie nicht allein Christen, sondern auch gehorsame trewe unterthanen gewesen, die leib und gut ynn Gottes Gehorsam bey yhre oberherrn zugesetzt haben. Selig und heilig sind sie ewiglich wie der fromme Urias."

<sup>43</sup> Ibid., XXX, 2, 175, 28: "So weistu ia wol, das du dennoch ein mal sterben must und keinen tag noch stunde des todes sicher bist. Wie wenn denn solcher streit widder den Tuercken eben dein stuendlein sein solt und von Gott also verordnet were? Solltestu nicht lieber, ia dazu mit freuden, dich allda Gott ergeben ynn einen solchen ehrlichen heiligen todt, da du so viel Goettlicher ursachen, gebot und befehl hast und sicher bist, das du nicht ynn deinen sunden, sondern ynn Gottes gebot und gehorsam stirbest, vielleicht ynn einem augenblick aus allem iammer kommst und gen hymel zu Christo aufflegst, denn das du auff dem bette muetest liggen und dich lange mit deinen sunden, mit dem tod und teuffel reissen, beissen, kempffen und ringen ynn aller fahr und not, und dennoch solche herrliche Gottes befehl und gebot nicht haben?"

<sup>44</sup> Ibid., XXX, 2, 177, 2.

war, even a religious war, or a crusade. But we cannot fully understand Luther's position on the war against the Turks unless we realize that for Luther there was also an eschatological element involved in this war.

Luther had tried to understand the Turkish danger in the light of the Book of Daniel. On the basis of his exegesis of Daniel, the Turk was for him an indication of the proximity of the *parousia*. The raging of the Antichrist in Turk and Pope made Luther hope that the Day of the Lord was at hand. The troubles of his time represented the birthpangs of the coming Kingdom. This confident hope was the reason that Luther left the ultimate defeat of Turk and Pope to the day of Jesus Christ that was soon to dawn. He said: "Our self-confidence will not defeat Gog.<sup>45</sup> . . . But thunder and lightning and the fire of hell will defeat him, as it once happened to Sennacherib. That will be his judgment and his end. For this judgment Christians must work with humble prayer. . . . If they don't do it, no one else will."<sup>46</sup>

To encourage Christians in their prayers and devotions, the Gospel had appeared again in its clarity. This Gospel and prayer were the weapons in the hands of Christian people. The end was at hand. Soon Christ would bring His judgment upon both the Pope and the Turk, rid the world of the Antichrist, and save us all with His glorious future. And Luther added that for this Day of Christ we wait daily.<sup>47</sup>

Luther knew that finally Antichrist, in whatever form he might appear, would be judged. But he knew also that this judgment would be God's judgment.<sup>48</sup> It is our task to do what we can to hasten this day of Jesus Christ. We can do it only with repentance and prayer and a life according to His Word.

This is the core of Luther's teachings about the Turks. He was concerned with the Turkish danger most of his life.

<sup>45</sup> For Luther the Turk is Gog. He developed this idea in his preface to the 38th and 39th chapter of Ezekiel. Cf. *Luthers Werke*, XXX, 2, 223 ff.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, XXX, 2, 226, 1.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, XXX, 2, 226, 7.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, XXX, 2, 172, 9: "Eben wenn das selb stuendlin kommen wird, das er so viel noch thun will und trotzig und gyrig sein wird, Da wird Christus mit schwefel und feur uber yhn komen und fragen waruemb er seine heiligen, die yhm kein leid gethan, on alle ursache so gewulich verfolget und geplaget habe."

The Turks played a part in his first teachings as well as in his last. But with an amazing consistency Luther never changed his basic attitude. The Turks were God's punishment of a proud and sinful Germany in 1541 as in 1517. Never did the political exigencies of the time change Luther's statements concerning these enemies.

Because Luther knew that the hope of the Christian is based solely upon the power of the Lord Jesus Christ, he concluded his booklet *On War Against the Turks* with these words: "I know that this book will not make the Turk a gracious lord to me, if it comes before him; nevertheless, I have wished to tell my Germans the truth, so far as I know it, and give faithful counsel and service to the grateful and ungrateful alike. If it helps, it helps; if it helps not, then may our dear Lord Jesus Christ help, and come down from heaven with the Last Judgment and smite both Turk and Pope to the earth, together with all tyrants and all the godless, and deliver us from all sins and from all evil."<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup> *Works of Martin Luther* (Philadelphia), V, 123.



---

## Homiletics

---

### Outlines on the Standard Epistle Lessons

#### EIGHTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

1 COR. 1:4-9

Paul will have many unpleasant things to say to the Corinthians, who had permitted many serious disorders to creep into their communion. But he wants to begin his letter with words of thanksgiving and encouragement. It were a sad situation indeed if hope were lost for a congregation or for individuals whenever sins and faults, even of a very serious nature, occur. Let us consider

#### PAUL'S DOXOLOGY A SOURCE OF STRENGTH IN SPIRITUAL WEAKNESS

He reminds us

- I. *That God alone could and did implant spiritual life in our hearts*
- II. *He alone can and intends to foster and revive that spiritual life unto its glorious consummation in heaven*

#### I

Vv. 4-7. The glorious things Paul thanks for may be summed up thus: He thanks for the good beginning which God has made among them, and for God's faithfulness, which gives him ground for the expectation that finally all things will turn out well for the spiritual welfare of the Corinthians. Paul thanks for God's gifts, not for personal achievements of the Corinthians. "God's grace" — all the gifts which flow from God's gracious disposition towards the sinner for Christ's sake: forgiveness of sins and all the graces that go with the new life of regeneration. Jesus Christ, the Mediator of this grace, is mentioned nine times in the first nine verses of this epistle. — This grace makes one "rich in everything." This grace has many phases. The Corinthians were endowed in a richer manner with special gifts of grace than other churches. "In all utterance." The Corinthians can speak of things spiritual in many ways, for their own comfort and strengthen-



ing as well as for the purpose of gaining others. The gift of tongues of chapter 14 is of course included, but "utterance" is much wider. "All knowledge," the believing knowledge of the Christian truths of the Gospel. "The testimony of Christ" (v. 6), the Gospel which was preached to them. "Confirmed," the preachers testified to things they themselves had experienced and knew to be the truth. "In you," among you. This confirming, therefore, is the effective, steadfast, faithful promulgation of the Gospel on the part of Paul and of the other preachers who were active in Corinth.

V. 7. They "come behind in no gift," they are richly endowed with all these gifts, ordinary and extraordinary, including love, ch. 13. There is only one thing lacking yet: they must yet wait "for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ" on the Last Day.

It were sad, indeed, if after such a glorious beginning the Corinthians were not to attain that final goal after all. In view of their many frailties such a catastrophe seemed rather probable. But Paul's confidence that things will end as gloriously for the Corinthians as they began remains unshaken, because it is placed solely on God.

## II

Satan was trying his best to wreck the beautiful work which God, through His Apostle and other Corinthian teachers, had wrought in Corinth. Yet Paul hopes and writes this epistle because of such hope.

V. 8. "Who" refers to God (v. 4). Paul is giving all glory to God. God will "confirm," keep steadfast, the Corinthians in the state He has begun. He will keep them "blameless in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ." Paul does not intend to say that the Corinthians were "blameless" at the time of his writing this letter. Yet God's purpose is to confirm them so that they will stand before Him unblamable in that great day. "Confirming" includes both justification and sanctification. To achieve this end, much labor of grace would still be required on the part of God.

Paul bases this assurance solely on the faithfulness of God. V. 9. Since God has at one time extended His call of grace to them, His faithfulness furnishes a guarantee that He will do all that is to be done on His part to bring everything to the proper ending. Cf. ch. 10: 13; 1 Thess. 5: 24; 2 Thess.

3:3; Phil. 1:6. The "fellowship" is participation in the gifts of grace with all other Christians made possible by Christ, Himself being the greatest and best Gift. Now already Christ is "our Lord." When He will be fully revealed as Lord (ch. 15:25; Phil. 2:2), then also the glorification of the Christians will be perfected, 2 Thess. 1:12; 2:14; 1 Thess. 2:12.

Our case is much like that of the Corinthians: in the past, inestimable grace; then, our loving response soon cooled under the cares and joys and the enmities of the world. Our only hope, but a sure hope, is the faithfulness of our God in Christ Jesus. He will bring us to a glorious sharing with Himself in heaven. Let the grace which God has granted in the past and the assurance of His faithfulness for the future make us truly grateful (1 Cor. 15:58). F. WENGER

## NINETEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

EPH. 4:22-28

The divine image consisted in this, that man knew God (Col. 3:10); that his will coincided with the holy will of God (text, v. 24); in his rule over the earth (Gen. 1:28); in his happy abode (2:8, 9); in immortality (2:17); and in the absence of evil lusts (2:25). After the loss of the divine image God still concerns Himself with fallen man, because in His love He would in Christ restore the whole human race to the divine image.

### THE RENEWAL OF THE DIVINE IMAGE IN BELIEVERS

#### *I. Wherein it consists*

#### *II. How it manifests itself*

#### I

A. The image of God was lost by the Fall. God created man after His likeness (Gen. 1:26), but Adam after the Fall begat sons and daughters "in his own likeness, after his image" (Gen. 5:3); cp. Ps. 51:5; John 3:6. All children of men are born haters of God (Rom. 8:7); with dead souls (Eph. 2:1; Rom. 8:6); spiritually blind (Eph. 5:8); and with an enslaved will (Rom. 8:6).

B. Restored by satisfaction wrought by Christ and through the renewal of the Holy Spirit (2 Cor. 5:17; 3:18; Col. 3:10). Text, vv. 22-24. Negative: "Put off . . . the old man"; the daily

crucifying and drowning of the old Adam (Rom. 6:6; Col. 3:9). "Concerning your former conversation": in respect to your former way of life as heathen (Eph. 5:8); fighting down the evil lusts and weakening the power of sin in the flesh. Positive: "Put on the new man" (Col. 3:10,12; Rom. 6:4); growing in knowledge of Christ (Eph. 4:12-14; 2 Pet. 3:18); the daily spiritual exercise of "growing into Him" (Eph. 4:15). The renewal of the divine image in believers consists in the continuation and growth of the gracious work which the Holy Spirit wrought in the Christian in regeneration. It is a process of growth (1 Thess. 4:1; 1 Cor. 15:58). "True Christians not only daily make ever new experiences of their sin, but also of the kindness of God and of the power of His grace. Daily they repent anew, believe anew, love anew, battle and conquer anew." Walther, *Ep. Postil*, p. 421.

## II

Renewal of the divine image manifests itself. The renewed man conquers sin. Luther: "If all sins are added together, they divide themselves into two groups, which are the devil's own peculiar work: the lie and murder." XII, 917-918.

A. V. 25. The regenerated man is a lover of truth. The Holy Spirit has created in him a mind which abhors lying hypocrisy (Prov. 13:5; 30:8; Ps. 119:163). In a liar we see not God's but the devil's image (John 8:44). The Christian's word is more reliable than the oath of an infidel. His frequent prayer is: Ps. 139:23-24.

B. V. 26. The renewed believer suppresses sinful anger. Luther: "A strange sentence is concluded and established here, that he who will not subdue his wrath and continue in anger a day or night, is no Christian. Then, where will they be who always nurse anger and hatred, one, two, three, seven, ten years? That is no longer a human, but a satanic anger out of hell." XII, 921. The Christian who has given way to angry words will seek reconciliation before nightfall. The image of God is seen in meekness (Prov. 15:1) and self-control (ch. 16:32; 25:28).

C. V. 28. Walther: "A hard statement for our day. This statement leaves few Christians in Christendom." *Ep. Postil*, p. 423. The renewed man will renounce all dishonest practices in acquiring and retaining property. He will shun

avarice, which is idolatry (Col. 3:5; Heb. 13:5), live in an honest calling and labor in order to be able to minister to the needy; especially at this time in Europe and Asia (Eccl. 11:1).

D. Where renewal in the divine image is not in evidence, there place is given to the devil, v. 26. When professed Christians offend by ungodly words and actions, the name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles (Rom. 2:24; Ez. 36:23).

The image of God will be restored in its fullness in heaven (Ps. 17:15; 1 Cor. 15:49). L. J. ROEHM

## THE FESTIVAL OF THE REFORMATION

ROM. 10:5-11

It is Scriptural and salutary practice, not idolatrous hero worship, to honor the memory of secular and spiritual benefactors, so long as the glory is given to God (Heb. 1:32-34; 13:7).

The blessings wrought through Martin Luther for home, state, school, Church, and individual are many. The grandest and most soul-satisfying is that he recognized and cleared away the debris with which the self-seeking Church of his day had cluttered and obstructed the way to heaven and by divine grace and power rediscovered and reopened for the Church and the world

### THE HIGH ROAD TO HAPPINESS AND GOD

- I. *This road consists in the acceptance of the righteousness of faith*
- II. *It is available to men in the Word of faith*
- III. *It demands and deserves faithful adherence and testimony*

#### I

The search for happiness and God has gone on almost since the Fall. Man's imperfect knowledge of the Creator, coupled with fear engendered by an accusing conscience (Rom. 1:18-20) and premonition of the final judgment, impels men to make and continue the quest for this road.

The choice lies between two. The nearly 1,200 unchristian religions agree on the basic principle of salvation by good conduct and work, and leave adherents hopeless:

A. This is true of pagans, who have not the Bible (Eph. 2:12).

B. True of Israel, which received written record of divine grace and will. Zeal for God, but not according to knowledge (v. 2). Failed to understand that the Law is to be a sin-revealing schoolmaster (Gal. 3:24) to prepare the way for the Gospel of the righteousness of faith in Christ, the end of the Law (v. 4).

C. Hopelessness of righteousness of the Law is seen in Paul and Luther, who found no peace till they found Christ (Eph. 1:17; Rom. 5:1; Hymn 387:1-5). Why? Law does not say *try*, but *do* (v. 5). Only perfect obedience can bring happiness. Accepting Christ, we have perfection, namely His. His blood cleanses from all sin.

## II

Where can we find the road to happiness and God? A clear answer is not always given, even by professing Christians. Jewish converts to the early Church kept insisting on observance of the Ceremonial Law (Acts 15:1 f.). Rome sent her children on crusades to Jerusalem and pilgrimages to Rome and even now decrees various holy exercises by which they should render themselves worthy of divine grace. Modernists hold Jesus up merely as teacher and model of good conduct. All mix works and grace, law and faith.

Vv. 6-8. The Apostle here personifies righteousness of faith, telling the seeker after happiness and God not to search far and wide, to bring Christ down from above or up from below. The road to happiness and God is right at hand in the Word of faith, the holy Gospel which he preached. Salvation is complete and offered to the sinner freely in the Gospel. This Word not only shows the way, but is the way, gives salvation (vv. 11, 17; James 1:18; 1 Pet. 1:23). It is the *only* road (Mark 16:16). Therefore it demands and deserves faithful adherence and testimony.

## III

Many people are willing to profess religion and hold church membership, but shun the cross (Matt. 13:21), encouraged by false Christians and prophets who assert that all religions are equally good.

God demands loyalty and bold confession. In today's



Gospel, Christ speaks of the kingdom of heaven suffering violence; "every man presseth into it" (Luke 16:16). Warns against false doctrine, unbelief, unbecoming conduct. Hence we must fight, hold to the faith, boldly confess Him (Matt. 10:32, 33), like Paul, Luther, and others.

Have you found the high road to happiness and God? If not, hear and accept now the Word which is nigh thee, repent, believe. If so, battle on; confess and make known this road to others. Say with Luther: "This one article rules my heart, namely, faith in Christ, out of which by day and night all my theological thoughts flow, by which they move, to which they return." The Word is nigh thee; read it, accept it, believe it; stake your all on it, be faithful to it unto the end.

OTTO E. SOHN

## TWENTIETH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

EPH. 5:15-21

"I have no time." How often do we hear this! In reality we all have time to do a great many things. Moreover, we usually have time to do the things we really want to do. It just depends on what things we give priority.

A Christian aims to apply Christian principles also as he practices the stewardship of time. First things first! Matt. 6:33. Our love to God will determine the order of our personal priorities. The text stresses this important feature of the Christian life:

### REDEEM THE TIME!

- I. What this means*
- II. Why it is so important*
- III. How we are to be ever ready for it*

#### I

Throughout our Christian life we are to redeem the time, make a wise use of our time. We can lose time, waste time, kill time. A misspent, wasted life — what a tragedy! How painful to review unmet opportunities! We all must plead guilty to neglecting many opportunities in our personal life and our church work (Ps. 103:10).

By the grace of God each day brings new opportunities. Use them wisely! (Gal. 6:10). Redeem the time! Let well-doing be the purchase-price by which you make time your

own. Because Jesus died for us, the time allotted to us is a time of grace (Is. 55:6; 2 Cor. 6:1-2). There is a time for family worship; use it! A time for daily Bible reading; use it! Many read their New Testament daily on the street car. V. 18: "Be filled with the Spirit." (2 Pet. 1:5-7.) Grow in Christian knowledge (2 Pet. 3:18). Every day offers opportunities for doing good. Hymns 439 and 441.

Thy kingdom come! Practice personal evangelism. Let *all* your planning and working aim at the promotion of God's kingdom. Help also your congregation and your Church to redeem the time. Use radio time, wherever available, for the Gospel. Europe and Asia cry to our Church: "Now is the time!"

## II

Redeeming the time is so important because the days are evil, v. 16. What makes them evil can be understood properly only in the light of God's Word (2 Tim. 3:1 ff.). Materialism. Pleasure madness. Popular demand for a this-world religion. Setting aside God's Word; adopting a shifting moral standard according to popular opinion. These evils reduce our opportunities and make the call to redeem the time the more urgent.

Time to be redeemed must be very precious. It is. Time frittered away can never be made up. Our yesterdays are beyond recall. — Time is rationed. Only one life to live, and it is very short. At best it is soon cut off (Ps. 90:10). So much to do and so little time! Therefore: Eccl. 9:10. As many examples show, much can by God's grace be accomplished in the span of a lifetime, if the minutes and hours are employed wisely, to the glory of God.

## III

How are we to be ever ready for redeeming the time?

A. Always make sure what the Lord's will is (v. 17). Use God's Word so that when new situations arise you may know what God expects of you.

B. Avoid excess. "Be not drunk with wine." Intoxication unfits the body, numbs mental powers, chokes spiritual life. Movie-going and cardplaying are easily carried to excess. Relaxation and recreation, yes; but being a Christian I have no time for that which unfits me (Neh. 6:3). I must

keep fit physically, mentally, spiritually, so as to be ready to recognize and seize my God-given opportunities.

C. V. 19. The ministry of music. Let psalms and hymns and spiritual songs help you maintain the spirit of cheerful Christian optimism.

D. V. 20. Be grateful for everything, also for every new opportunity to do good. The appropriate time for giving thanks is always.

E. V. 21. Co-operate with your fellow Christians (Phil. 2:3; Rom. 12:10). Two working together can accomplish more than twice as much as one can do alone.

Redeem the time, make the most of each day, for the sun of your life may be about to set (John 9:4). Live with eternity in view (1 Cor. 7:29-31). Lord Jesus, who hast redeemed me that I may be Thine own,

Take my moments and my days,  
Let them flow in ceaseless praise. Amen.

V. L. MEYER

## TWENTY-FIRST SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

EPH. 6:10-17

"Every life is a tragedy!"

Is that true?

It is true of unbelievers. Of such David said: Ps. 39:6.

But there are people of whom it is not true that every life is a tragedy. There are people whose life is a glorious triumph. At their tomb we can truthfully say: 1 Cor. 15:55, 57.

How about you? Is your life to be a tragedy, or is it to be a victory? — However, remember, if your life is to be a victorious life, you must fight a victorious battle.

### HOW MAY WE CHRISTIANS GAIN THE VICTORY OVER OUR FOES?

#### *I. We must know our foes and their methods*

A. "We wrestle not against flesh and blood." True, we may also have enemies among men. There is much envy, jealousy among men, at school, in business, in the professions. Abraham, Jacob, Moses, David, etc., had such enemies.

B. Our text is referring to far more dangerous enemies

than such men as Pharaoh, Ahithophel, Saul. It speaks of "principalities, powers," etc. All this refers to the devil and his legions. True, there are those who tell us there is no devil, but these people have never been able to tell us who is doing the devil's work, of which we hear and read so much in this world. God has told us, There is a devil and many evil spirits, and they have greater power than any human being. (Cp. 1 Pet. 5:8; 2 Cor. 2:11; etc.) The devil brought misfortune and misery upon poor Job; misled our first parents and robbed them and us of our precious image of God. The devil even tried to mislead Jesus. That is the first thing to which we must give attention if we would win the victory. Know your real foe, study his "wiles" as he tempted Adam and Eve, Saul, David, even the Lord Jesus.

*II. There are weapons which we must learn to use.*

But do not become so frightened that you are willing to surrender without a battle. "Put on the whole armor of God."

Our loins must be girded about with truth, *i. e.*, as a soldier must gird himself for the fight, so we Christians must be sincere, earnest, and truthful. Deceit, indecision, or hypocrisy will lose us the battle.

The "breastplate of righteousness" is to protect the vital parts of his body. The Christian breastplate must be righteousness. Here not Christ's righteousness, but our own upright life as a fruit of our faith.

"Having our feet shod with the preparation of the Gospel of peace." The soldier must be sure-footed, and for that purpose must be properly shod. Just so we Christians must make sure that we are standing firm on the true Foundation, Jesus Christ, who came into the world to save sinners. There is no slipping there.

"Taking the shield of faith," etc. All these weapons of defense are laid hold of by faith, and this faith is generated and supported continually by God's Word. Let us make sure that this faith remains firm and sound, for this "faith is the victory that overcometh the world," it quenches every fiery dart of the Wicked One. If doubts assail, if accusations be hurled at us, our faith nullifies their effect. Read Heb. 11.

Therefore also we take the helmet of salvation. Just as the helmet protects the soldier's head, so our very head is

covered by our hope of eternal life. We dare never lose sight of our goal, namely, that though we suffer with Christ, we shall finally reign with Him (1 Pet. 1:3 and 4).

Our text adds a weapon of offense, "the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God." See how Jesus conquered the assaults of the devil by again and again saying, "It is written" (Heb. 4:12). In addition to all this

*III. The Christians must be "strong in the Lord."*

He dare not give way to carnal security, but must remain conscious of his own weakness and look to God for strength. Remember you are God's soldiers. God has given you your armor. He has given you instructions concerning your foe, and He will answer your prayers by giving you His Holy Spirit. Therefore we are to say with Luther:

With might of ours can naught be done,  
Soon were our loss effected, etc.

If your life is not to be a tragedy, but a triumph, then respond to the appeal of our text, and you will be one of that great multitude: Rev. 7:9; Ps. 91:7, 9, 15. M. S. SOMMER





---

## Miscellanea

---

### An Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education

BY EMIL F. PETERSON \*

The purpose of this article is to discuss the Lutheran day school as one of the agencies which the Lutheran Church employs for assisting its parents in the task of giving to their children a sound religious knowledge and training, and a general education in keeping with the standards of the state.

The Lutheran day school functions on the elementary educational level. However, a study of the history of the Lutheran Church reveals the fact that the Lutheran day school is not a widely used institution when one considers the Lutheran Church in the United States as a whole. Large sections of the Lutheran Church have never fostered this institution. Some portions which fostered it from the beginning no longer have such Lutheran day schools. The only portion of the Lutheran Church which still promotes the Lutheran day school with any degree of vigor is the portion known as the Synodical Conference, and even here one often feels that the Lutheran day school is losing ground. What may be the cause for this? Why is the Lutheran day school not becoming a still more vital factor in elementary education in the Lutheran Church? Is the institution at fault?

Questions of this nature must be answered if the Lutheran day school would become a more vital factor in elementary education in the Lutheran Church. A sound evaluation must be made. This is one of the tasks which was set before a small group of pastors doing seminar work in the field of education with Prof. Ove S. Olson, Ph.D., head of Department of Education at Gustavus Adolphus College in St. Peter, Minn.

This evaluation of a Lutheran day school education is a subjective, personal evaluation by the graduates of a Lutheran day school. Other more objective studies are being developed. This subjective evaluation was sought by means of a questionnaire mailed to graduates of a Lutheran day school. A questionnaire was drawn up. The school selected for an evaluation was an eight-grade school in an urban community in Minnesota, numbering upwards of 20,000 population. The school has functioned with an average enrollment of 135 pupils per year. For some time the school's faculty numbered three, but during the last three or four years the faculty has been increased, so that it now has one man teacher and three women teachers. During the past fifteen years, the school graduated some 160 children. From this list of graduates 16 names were stricken, because all contact with those persons had been lost. A few of them have already gone to their

---

\* The Rev. Emil F. Peterson is director of Christian education of Immanuel Ev. Luth. Church, Mankato, Minn.

eternal reward. To the remaining 144 the questionnaires were mailed. Ninety-seven of the questionnaires were mailed to addresses in the community in which the school is located. Fourteen of them were mailed to other cities in Minnesota; 17 were mailed to other States in the Union, and 16 of them were sent to persons in the service of their country. Returns were very slow at first. However, after several follow-up letters, results were more encouraging. To date, 53 questionnaires have been returned. This is slightly more than a third of the total, and from these returns it should be possible to present the trend. The questionnaire was divided into four sections, namely, general information, religious aspects of a Lutheran day school education, secular aspects of a Lutheran day school education, and finally, the effect of a Lutheran day school education on subsequent church membership. Each of these sections will be considered separately.

### General Information About the Graduates

The general information relative to the fifty-three graduates who returned the questionnaire is very enlightening. The average age of this group was 19.1 years, and the median age is 19 years. The range, so far as age is concerned, is from 13 to 27 years of age. Their occupations are also interesting. Twenty-one of them are still students; 12 are housewives; 5 are in the service of their country; 4 are secretaries; 2 are teachers; 2 are machine operators; 1 is a farmer; 1 is a mechanic; 1 does housework; 1 is a checker; 1 is a bookkeeper; 1 is a clerical worker; and 1 is a truck driver. This group is composed of 14 males and 39 females. Fifteen are married and 38 are single. Those married have been married on an average of 3.1 years and have an average of 1 child. Eleven of the group married Lutherans, and 4 did not. These 53 people attended the Lutheran school on an average of 6.5 years during the years 1925—1945. All 53 received diplomas from the school in the following years: 1931—3; 1932—3; 1933—2; 1934—5; 1935—5; 1936—2; 1937—2; 1938—3; 1939—2; 1940—5; 1941—6; 1942—3; 1943—2; 1944—5; 1945—5. All 53 enrolled in a public junior high school, and 45 completed junior high school; 3 did not, and 5 are in junior high school now. Thirty-seven went on to senior high school; 7 did not, and 9 have not yet entered, but intend to go on to high school. Thirty-two finished senior high school; 8 did not, and 13 have not yet completed senior high school. Twenty-four of them continued with their education beyond senior high school; 17 of them did not, and 2 are still hoping to continue. Of the 24 who continued their education, 2 have received B.S. degrees; 2 have received B.A. degrees; 3 have received A.A. degrees, 2 have received A.A. and B.A. degrees in accredited colleges in the State of Minnesota. Of the remainder 1 has done junior college work; 3 have some normal training; 6 have commercial college training; 1 has junior college and normal training; 1 has normal and commercial college train-

ing; 1 has additional training in a music conservatory, and 2 are in nurse's training. Forty-nine of the group listed themselves as active members of the Lutheran Church; 2 gave no church affiliation; 1 is affiliated with the Roman Catholic Church, and 1 gave no answer to the question. The follow-up question concerning church affiliation: "If no, why are you not an active member of the Lutheran Church?" was answered as follows: the girl who joined the Catholic Church alleges that "after 2 years of conscientious study of several religions, due to the fact that I felt a 'lack' of feeling of something missing in the Lutheran religion, I studied Catholicism and am convinced it is the true religion." One girl stated that she was not an active member because of failure to transfer her membership. These were the only answers to this question.

### **Religious Aspects of Lutheran Day School Education**

The second section of the questionnaire covers the religious aspects of a Lutheran day school education. One of the first questions in this section was: "What does the religious training which you received in the Lutheran day school mean to you?" The following quotations are representative of the answers given to this question: "It means that I had inbred in me the truth of the Bible and the basic doctrines of the Lutheran Church at an early age—a background less easily persuaded to doubt and an uncertainty of belief in later years." "It taught me right and wrong and how the Bible wants us to live as Christians." "It gave a deep understanding of the grace of God." "I think the religious training I received will aid me in rearing my children to be good Christians." "My religious training has meant very, very much to me. It has been my happiness during sunny days and my guiding light and only support through darkest nights." "It obviously meant a great deal and has been one of the basic factors both in the maintenance of my faith and in setting before me relatively high aims in life." "My religious training meant very much to me. I felt I was fully prepared for confirmation when I reached that age." "To me it meant a stronger faith and a better understanding of God's Word." "It taught me to really know my Savior, and helped me to decide for myself right from wrong when I got out in the world. It made me lead a better Christian life." "It means very much. It gave me a very sound background and foundation upon which to continue my Lutheran training. It gave me something very precious that I can keep all my life." "It means a firm, real foundation for a religious belief in a Triune God, a desire to do His will and, if possible, to help other people find such a belief."

In response to the question "Was your faith strengthened?" fifty answered yes. No negative answers were recorded for this question, but 3 left the question unanswered. Forty-two thought that the religious knowledge received was adequate; 2 did not answer the question, and 9 were of the opinion that their religious knowledge was not adequate. Their opinions as to what was lack-

ing may be seen from the following quotations: "The religious training was quite thorough and adequate as far as it went; but had my religious training ended there, I doubt that it would have been adequate for life." "I think we could have had more practical religion for our daily lives." "The integration of faith with daily life, not in so far as making religious knowledge a rigid standard by which to live, but rather to make of it a constant companion, a natural component of everyday life and thought." "As a foundation in doctrine it was adequate, but I feel religion should live in a child's life." "We had the same Bible History from the sixth to eighth grade." "It was not adequate because we discussed same Bible History from sixth to eighth grade."

In answer to the question whether the religious teaching was effective, 49 answered yes; 2 said no, and 2 did not answer. The two who said no, wrote: "We need teachers who either by interest in promotion of children's activities or actual participation in such activities can make their Christianity a more integral part of each student's life." "It took some hard experience to make me realize what a living, working faith can be. A child can and should be given help in that direction."

A question concerning whether any other type of religious training would have meant the same was misunderstood by 18 of those who returned the questionnaire. They understood the question to mean a religious training outside the Lutheran Church. Six did not answer the question. Of the remaining 29, 24 thought that no other religious training could replace their Lutheran day school training, and 5 thought that Sunday school or some other type could have meant the same.

Whether these graduates of the Lutheran day school would send their children to a Lutheran day school brought out a good deal of discussion. Thirty-nine said that they would. Two were uncertain; 1 said "for a few years"; 4 did not answer the question, and 7 answered no. Those who would, gave their reasons as follows: "I would because I think a child should have religious training each day besides that taught at home, in Sunday school, and in confirmation classes." "There the child receives the 'one thing needful.'" "There secular knowledge is taught in the light of God's Word. There discipline is based on God's Word. There the child is under the influence of a Christian teacher." "Yes, for by receiving daily instruction in addition to what I would teach them, they would have a definite and lasting impression of Christ and His way of life and live their lives accordingly." "Yes, I would send my children to a Lutheran day school, for the religious training received at home and Sunday school is not enough." "I would send them to a Lutheran school because it would give them a background for their future life that couldn't be replaced as fully in any other way."

Some who said they would not send their children gave the following reasons: "I would want approved, educational facilities similar to those of the public schools." "Because the advantages

of a public school are much greater. Better trained teachers and more material to work with." "The religious training was effective, but other subjects did not compare with the same grades in the public school; therefore it makes it harder when you enter public schools." "It seemed harder to start in public school after attending Lutheran day school."

A question with reference to whether or not the Lutheran day school as it was known by these graduates has a place in our present educational system was answered yes by 43; no answer from 2; yes and no, 1; with few improvements, 1; and 6 declared no. Reasons advanced by those who answered positively may be seen from the following: "Leading educators admit that religious training is an important part of education and the building of character." "Because scholastically it is equal to the public school, and the religious angle is our advantage." "Because of the achievements and successes of its former students." "I believe religion should daily be taught to all children, for it certainly makes them more conscious of God and the debt we owe to Him and combats juvenile delinquency." "I believe a Lutheran day school is very important, especially nowadays, since it gives the students a better knowledge of God's Word and helps them to appreciate their Church." "Modern education still talks of 'aims and objectives'—our school had a *real* aim and objective; it teaches the ultimate meaning of life. Besides eternal life, a goal in our temporal life is a good psychological asset." "I believe if there were more schools of this type, and if they became powerful and well organized, the future of our nation would not be a thing to cause so much worry." "Yes, the State has failed. Now it is up to the Word of God." "I think that the Lutheran day school has a place and should have a place in our present-day educational system, for it is religion that makes better men and women." "Because the present-day morals are low, and Christian training is the strongest influence for building good character." "Parents want their children to learn the Christian ways, and they can learn them and receive a better understanding of them when they spend schooltime learning and not one hour on Sunday." Those whose answer to this question was negative gave as their reason the following: "It is complete in religious instruction, but lacks in other instruction because of not enough space for experiments in science, physical education, and training." "It does not have the proper equipment." "Because most schools are going in for athletics and sports, which we didn't have, and sports are playing an important role in the present and future education." "Have not enough time for each subject, and there are too many subjects. Cannot learn as well." "Because it lacks physical training, recreation, and other subjects the public school offers."

### **Secular Aspects of a Lutheran Day School Education**

The third section of the questionnaire concerned the secular aspects of a Lutheran day school education, and the first question



in this section concerned a rating of the secular education received in the Lutheran day school. In answer to this question, 10 rated their secular education as excellent; 26 as good; 11 as fair; and 2 as poor, and 4 gave no answer. Those who rated their secular education as excellent stated the following: "It must have been excellent, because I never had any trouble in high school or college." "Our classes, even if not always equipped with the latest in texts, laboratory gadgets which a public school could afford, were aimed at giving a solid factual background for high school work. Composition and outlining were stressed to a very practical advantage." "In comparing ourselves with our friends who came in the ninth grade from public schools, we were definitely more advanced." "I am very sure I would not have been taught or learned any more in a public school. What I appreciated the most was the Christian background in all the subjects." "In high school I have always been in the upper third of my class and several times on the honor roll. This background of my knowledge I received in the Lutheran day school." "An average student does not have difficulty when attending a public school after his basic education at a Lutheran day school."

Those who rated their secular education as good expressed themselves thus: "Only good because they are not as strict with the students in getting their lessons. They seem to be much more lenient than the public schools." "With the exception of a few subjects the secular education of a Lutheran day school is similar to any other institution. The few subjects not included have only a slight effect on later education." "Excellent to me means there is little or no room for improvement, and that is not the case in any school; but it was good in that I never found myself inferior to students of public schools." "My personal secular education was fully as adequate as that of my public school friends."

Those who rated their secular education as fair declared: "It does not offer as many subjects as public schools do." "As I remember it, there was a lack of variety in subjects." "The subjects in most cases were good. In seventh and eighth grade, English was low compared with most schools, but mathematics on the other hand is higher." "Teaching methods are inefficient." "In the Lutheran day school I was an A student, and in the public school a B or C student. This is because we did not have everything in the Lutheran school and in the public school it was completely new."

Those who rated their secular education as poor said: "We missed cooking, serving, the proper musical education, and gymnastics." "The Lutheran day school I attended fell short in too many subjects. The religion course was excellent, but every subject that is taught in a public school should also be taught in a Lutheran day school. As in my case, I went to a public school after graduation from the Lutheran day school, and it was very hard at first because there were so many subjects we had not had."

The following question concerned any advantage or difficulty

in transferring to public schools. Seventeen had an advantage; 16 did not have an advantage; 6 made no transfer, and 14 gave no answer. Nineteen experienced difficulty, and 14 did not, and no answer was given by 14. Six made no transfer to public schools.

Those who experienced an advantage described their advantage thus: "I had the advantage of being able to memorize things easily. This ability was taught to me through memorizing daily hymns and Bible passages." "Sounder knowledge of some subjects such as literature, ancient history, music, and the like." "There was an advantage in the grammar, arithmetic, and geography which I learned in the Lutheran school. It was much more adequate than children in the public school received." "A more cultural background due to serious religious training." "I was posted to a certain extent on the theory of evolution which is present in history and science classes. It did not cause any confusion in my mind." "I felt I had an understanding of right and wrong in dealings with other people, as well as a knowledge of prayer to strengthen me." "I was ahead of all my classmates."

Those who experienced a difficulty stated the difficulty as follows: "It was hard to get into clubs and gangs, because most of the others knew everyone else since they first started school." "I had difficulty in science." "The studies were harder, and the teachers were stricter." "I found the studies hard to get." "In the ninth grade, I especially had difficulty in mathematics. Also, my study habits in school were not the best." "It was harder to start public school." "I had no difficulty exactly, but I found on entering high school that I was lacking in some specific knowledge in science and English grammar." The reasons for these difficulties were stated thus: "The standard of subjects is below that of public schools." "Some of the problems that came up in mathematics and other subjects were not fully explained. We would go on to another lesson without fully understanding the previous one." "I do not believe the work is as hard as it is in the public schools." "If day school students could enter a public school without a feeling of inferiority, that seems to be predicted, there would be no trouble. It was only natural for most of us to feel a little backward when we knew how different the other schools were to be, and there seems to be a lack of facilities in the school."

The next question in this section referred to a rating of scholarships in high school. Sixteen of the group rated their scholarship in high school as good; 12 rated their scholarship as fair; 16 as average, and 1 as poor. Eight did not answer the question.

A question asking whether in the opinion of these graduates a public school education would have offered better opportunities than a day school education was answered in the affirmative by 9 and in the negative by 40, and no answer was recorded by 4.

Those who were of the opinion that a public school education would have offered better opportunities than a Lutheran day school education made the following statements: "In shop, mechanical drawing, and agricultural classes." "I think I would have been

better fitted for my junior and senior high school years. Even in college I came across things I had not fully understood in grade school." "The Lutheran day school gives no chance for personality development as a public school does." "The facilities mentioned above, plus the mingling with more students and the limitations of one class per room, allowing for more concentration and less confusion." "Physical education and a science laboratory would be provided." "I would have had a better background for my teaching profession."

So far as additional activities in the public school are concerned, 34 of these graduates were positive that additional activities were offered by the public school. Sixteen of them were not, and 3 did not answer the question. Among the activities offered by the public school of which these graduates were deprived in the Lutheran day school, were athletics, home economics, physical education, sewing, cooking, shop, mechanical drawing, domestic science, regular study periods, general assemblies, glee clubs, band or orchestra, experimental work, drama clubs, visual instruction, library activities, lyceum speakers, social activities, and practice in public speaking.

When asked whether these activities had any effect on their lives, 10 answered yes; 27 answered no, and 16 did not answer the question. Some of the effects are contained in the following statements: "I have never had the fundamentals of home economics usually picked up by other girls in grade school, and I have missed it. I have also missed the gym training given in other schools." "I believe being deprived of these things affects a person's future education rather than having an effect on your life." "The effect so far has been slight, but with the broadening of educational facilities, the effect will be greater in the future. If I had more training in sciences and languages, my opportunities for advancement would be very good." "I was not prepared for the full school life the public school offered. I had no chance to develop my personality when I was young." "I feel a definite tenseness in social affairs to which I had no proper introduction as a child." "It has perhaps caused me an inferiority complex." "The obvious effects I had was difficulty in the ninth grade in getting up in front of the class and giving a report. This one problem took years to remedy."

#### **Effects of a Lutheran Day School Education on Subsequent Church Membership**

The final section of this survey concerned the effect of a Lutheran day school education on subsequent church membership. In this section it was found that these graduates attend church on the average of 3.2 times a month. They attend Communion on an average of 4.3 times a year. Two indicated that they were serving a Lutheran congregation, one as a teacher and one as an organist. Thirty-seven of them did not hold any office in a Lutheran congregation, and 14 did not answer the question. Their activity so far as organizations in the Lutheran Church was as follows: 17 were ac-

tive in young people's organizations; 5 were active in Sunday school work; 7 in choir work, and 2 were active in women's organizations.

The money question has not been solved in the Lutheran Church. Forty-one of the graduates did not answer the question concerning the portion of their income contributed to the church. The 11 who did answer the question contribute on an average of 5 per cent of their income, and 1 indicated that \$20 a year was being contributed. However, 20 did indicate how they apportioned their contribution. Fourteen of them give 50 per cent to the local congregation; 2 of them give 60 per cent to the local congregation and 40 per cent to missions; 2 of them give 75 per cent to the local congregation and 25 per cent to missions, and 2 of them give 66 $\frac{2}{3}$  per cent to the local congregation and 33 $\frac{1}{3}$  per cent to missions.

At the end of the questionnaire an opportunity was given for additional remarks and suggestions, and some of the statements that appear in this section are significant. One young man writes: "Offer the students more subjects, and let them have a choice." "Where there are two and three classes in one room, there should be an extra room for a study hall. There should be more outside activities. Having a speech class that presents plays would give the children many benefits." "The teaching and administrative work should be separated." "I certainly enjoyed, and received a great benefit from, the year I went to Lutheran school. I only wish I had gone there longer." "Enlargement of the teaching staff and enlargement on subjects of a scientific nature." "I definitely think that there should be a new school." "A good physical education program should be planned. A better course in science should be taught. There should be extracurricular activities during the entire year." "More discipline, better library. The school should maintain a higher standard." "Improvement of playgrounds, supervised play, and facilities for indoor sports." "More definite class schedules which are followed by teachers." "New textbooks and approved methods of teaching." "More current topics." "Let's have an art class that gives the children a chance to express themselves and not an art class that consists of tracing a picture out of a book."

The authors of this study are fully aware of the shortcomings of this type of investigation, but in spite of its shortcomings, it does show the evaluation which the graduates of a Lutheran day school place upon the education they received. In order that a comparison may be made of several Lutheran day schools, the authors of this study are interested in making evaluations of a similar nature in other Lutheran day schools, and anyone interested is invited to write to the authors for further details. It is also realized that this is a personal, subjective evaluation; for that reason other more objective standards of evaluation are being developed, which will in the end give a rather complete picture of the Lutheran day school and the type of education it offers.

The results of the study presented here are recorded for the purpose of study by all concerned, and as the results are studied, many things will be brought to light. Some general impression, however, cannot escape the attention of the reader.

The study shows that the Lutheran day school merits consideration and study by the Lutheran Church as a whole, and more careful attention by those groups of the Lutheran Church which still are promoting this type of elementary education. Furthermore, it proves that certain statements with reference to the Lutheran day school are false. It is often said that a Lutheran day school education stints the desire to continue one's education. This study shows that more than two-thirds of the graduates continued or will continue in high school, while almost half went on with their educational work beyond high school. The study shows that so far as religious training and knowledge is concerned, no apologies need be made for the work of the Lutheran school. Furthermore, it shows that the graduates of the Lutheran day school are willing to give their support to the Lutheran day school. The study shows that this Lutheran school was weak in the general education which was offered, and, perhaps, here is where the greatest lessons can be learned. It is an issue which should be faced frankly and honestly. While there are those who seem to think that all evils in this sphere are removed by the religious training received, the fact remains, and this study supports it, that if the Lutheran day school is to be a still more vital factor in elementary education, it must maintain standards in general education set by other schools.

Immediately connected with this problem are the extracurricular activities. While some may be uninterested in such activities, the study indicates that this problem and the problem of standards mentioned above are the real stumbling block for the Lutheran day school. In this connection the contention that the Lutheran day school has not fitted itself into the trends of modern times is correct. Many of the problems of extracurricular activities are problems of the junior high school age. Where congregations are operating an eight-grade school, these problems arise because the system is wrong. Two things are possible. The one is to limit the Lutheran day school to six grades, so that junior high school problems will not arise. The other and more practical, where feasible, is to add the last year of junior high school, making the Lutheran school consist of six elementary grades and three years junior high school. Where this is done, the congregation must provide sufficient space, facilities, and teaching staff to carry on junior high school work. It must, also, make provision for some of the extracurricular activities which are promoted in these grades in other schools.

All in all, the Lutheran day school is a worthy cause. If it will make a few adjustments to meet modern tendencies, it can be a still more vital factor in elementary education.



---

## Theological Observer

---

**What About Church Unity?**—Under this heading Ernest Gordon in the *Sunday School Times* (May 11, 1946) quotes the following timely and important advice to churches now considering organic church unity: "In *What About Church Unity?* (Atlantic Monthly, January, 1946) Canon Bell makes a searching analysis of the matter. 'There are two fissures in Protestantism, one horizontal (denominationalism) and the other vertical. The agitators for church union concern themselves with the first only, which is the less important. Christians can get along well enough in their present denominational relationships, but the Church is riven vertically by fundamental differences in belief, a theological divergence of the first magnitude.' It has to do with 'basic questions about man, about God, about the existence or non-existence of the supernatural, about whether Jesus Christ is only an excellent human sage or God-made man for man's salvation from man's incurable folly and weakness of will.' 'If you bring the denominations together in one [without bringing about an agreement on these points and others], you but prepare for conflict on larger battlefields.' Mr. T. S. Eliot has said that 'the deepest cleavage in human life is between those who believe in revelation and those who deny it.' In all the major denominations this chasm is apparent. Those who control the denominational machines and the Federal Council are, on the whole, on the side of denial. They give lip service to inspiration, but define it away. To Neo-Unitarians, impressed with man's greatness, Canon Bell says, in a fine passage: 'Because the race is what inherently it is, man gets nowhere much [in religious philosophy] by way of progress in time. He tears down what his fathers built and builds again what his children will reduce to rubble. His history moves in cycles of development and decay. Fiercely gazing into the future for meaning, he rides on a merry-go-round which takes him over and over again to where he was before. This is what the Bible teaches. The traditional Christian is of the opinion that it [this] is what the study of history also reveals. Since there is no significance for man in terms of progress, since man cannot solve his problem by pulling at his own bootstraps, even such admirable bootstraps as science provides, man must and can be saved from futility only by the intervention of God. Christianity is a religion of redemption.'"

J.T.M.

**Dr. Bersell on Lutheran Union.**—In his address at the recent convention of the Augustana Synod Dr. Bersell, president of that body, stated that the "door of the establishment of a Lutheran federation of churches stands open today," and he added that although "selfish interests, racial traditions, parochial loyalties, provincial prejudices, and theological hairsplittings hinder us from entering now, I dare prophesy that it shall not be for long." The

factors which Dr. Bersell enumerates may be real and potent. We are thinking especially of his reference to theological hairsplittings. That there is such a thing and that here and there in the Lutheran Church in America people engage in it, cannot be denied. But it must be stated definitely that not all the theological controversies which are going on these days belong to the category of theological hairsplitting. There is the question of the inerrancy of the Scriptures. The great majority of Lutherans hold the Scriptures are inerrant. Some theologians say that such a position concerning the Scriptures is untenable. Can anybody say that in debating the question whether the Scriptures are inerrant or not, we are merely splitting hair? It is a vital question, and if we are not altogether mistaken, this question forms the ridge which constitutes the dividing line between Modernism and Conservatism. Whatever a person may think of a number of other questions that are debated, here, at any rate, one cannot say that mere empty straw is being threshed and that the debaters are simply fighting windmills. A.

**Will Separation of Church and State Survive?**—On this question a writer in the *Watchman-Examiner* voices the conviction that separation of Church and State is doomed unless the people who see what a great boon this separation constitutes are willing to defend it. It is a sentiment that needs to be stressed. The writer, William B. Adams of Washington, D. C., concludes with these words, "This doctrine is imbedded in American tradition. Jefferson, who is probably the best interpreter of this tradition, has given us a concrete example in the founding of the University of Virginia. He maintained that it is the purpose of the State to provide free secular education. He also maintained that the various religious groups should come to the border of the campus, establish their denominational schools, and provide care for sectarian education. But all secular education could be obtained under the direction of the State at his university. This doctrine has been the basis of American life from that day until now. Every other doctrine is foreign, un-American, and un-Christian." The last epithet may be too strong. If the writer means to say that the New Testament does not favor a mixing of Church and State, he is right. A.

**Religious Conditions in the Russian Zone in Germany.**—A staff reporter of the *Protestant Voice* writes as follows on conditions in the zone occupied by the Russians in Germany:

"God is being 'quarantined' in the Russian-occupied zone of Germany. At the present rate, the district will end as a mere communist-dominated colony of the Soviet Union. Religion is outlawed, except inside the churches. The Germans are allowed to attend services. That is the extent to which they may go. They are not permitted to carry the principles of their religious faith into public life. All public institutions are being forced systematically into the Marxian mold.

"The Communist 'Quislings' of Moscow are rapidly getting control of all civil affairs.

"While it is true that, as a rule, church life in the Russian zone is not interfered with at the present time, yet it is quite another story when it comes to religious activities outside of the church buildings.

"The Soviet authorities refuse permission to print religious books or to issue any kind of religious publications or periodicals. They object seriously to religious bodies organizing their own societies and holding meetings which are not a part of regular divine services of worship.

"This applies particularly to the younger generation which is absorbed completely in so-called 'anti-fascist' groups that are strictly controlled by Communist officials and provide the channel for the indoctrination of both girls and boys of every age group with Marxian ideology.

"Despite the formal agreement among the occupational powers whereby religious instruction must be imparted in the public schools if the parents request it, no such liberty is granted in the Russian zone. School teachers are selected and appointed without consultation of church authorities and most of them are hostile to Christian ideals.

"The people now residing in the Soviet zone remain virtually isolated from the rest of Germany and the outside world. One pastor told a correspondent: 'We live behind a Chinese wall. We cannot communicate with our Bishops. Our Bishops, unless they live in our zone, are unable to visit us. There is dire need of Bibles, but none are available. As radio sets were widely confiscated in the early months after the war, we cannot even listen to broadcasts that might bring solace, information, and encouragement. And, of course, the newspapers are edited entirely along Communist lines and religion is being ignored.'

"In addition to all this, there is the ghastly plight of the German refugees that pour like an endless stream into the Soviet zone from Silesia and Poland. There are over five millions of them. Very few pastors are left to care for their spiritual needs. Children who have lost their parents and wander about aimlessly receive no religious guidance whatsoever.

"To be sure, there is a crying need of relief, but private organizations are denied access to the Russian zone and the local organizations cannot cope with the task which beggars description."

A.

**Chaplains Needed for Veterans' Hospitals.**—On this subject *Religious News Service* submits this report:

"Gen. Omar Bradley, director of the Veterans' Administration, in a message to the 157th General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. at Atlantic City, N. J., said the VA hospital load is expected to reach its peak in 1965 when 600 chaplains will probably be needed.

"Gen. Bradley said the establishment of a chaplaincy service in the VA had started a work 'which will prove to be of increasing religious value and significance.'

"In June, 1945,' he said, 'the VA was employing 11 full-time chaplains and 170 on a part-time basis. Now there are 130 full-time chaplains working in 81 hospitals under direction of a chief and four assistants.'

"It is my desire that two aspects of our relationship shall be kept in the forefront of the thinking of our chaplains and the Church,' he said. 'First, that the chaplains should always be conscious that they are ministers of the churches; second, that the Church should always be conscious that the chaplains are their representatives in a great and challenging religious ministry.'

**Some Information Concerning German Universities.**—The *Theologische Zeitschrift*, published by the theological faculty of the University of Basel, in the May-June number for 1946 submits some interesting and pertinent information on library conditions at German universities. In Vienna the theological library of 40,000 volumes has remained intact. In Muenster the library of the university has to a large extent been destroyed, but the theological seminaries had removed their books, and thus they were nearly all preserved. The University of Giessen owned 75,000 volumes, of which only 40,000 are still extant. The journal mentioned furthermore informs us that the University of Giessen has ceased to exist, with the exception of a section pertaining to agriculture and forestry. While Leipzig was very heavily bombed, the university was reopened February, 1946. In Berlin the university apparently has gone into action, although the report says that the so-called ordinary professorships have not yet been filled in any one of the various theological disciplines. A.

**Roman Catholics and Tolerance.**—In the *Lutheran* of July 10 an article appears with the heading, "Can Catholics Be Tolerant?" We quote from the second part of the article.

"What will happen to us Protestants if it does occur? Will the principles of tolerance prevail? Will Protestants be given full liberty of practice, discussion, and propaganda? We Protestants would like to believe that, but we find it a little difficult, in view of the character of many authoritative Roman Catholic pronouncements, ranging all the way from papal encyclicals to definitive exposition of Catholic teaching in recognized authorities.

"Back in 1927, when it was practically certain that Alfred E. Smith would be the presidential candidate of the Democratic party in the following year, a controversy arose on this point. Smith's ecclesiastical mentor in this controversy was Msgr. John A. Ryan. His chief antagonist was a New York lawyer named Charles C. Marshall. Marshall protested against the presidential candidacy of a Roman Catholic, claiming that Catholics did not believe in the separation of church and state, and were not prepared to grant tolerance to other religious groups, provided they had the power

to deny it. In Smith's answer, he argued for the right of every American to choose his own religion and be free and secure in the practice of it. He said in effect: I'll be a good Catholic. You be a good Protestant. And we'll each respect and support the other. That pronouncement was hailed as a salutary and essentially American statement.

"But it was not regarded with favor in the Catholic world outside the United States. Catholic papers in Europe began to ask what kind of Catholic was this who proposed equality to Protestants? The *Syllabus of Errors* of Pius IX of 1864, and the encyclical of Leo XIII on the Christian constitution of states (*Immortale Dei*, 1881) began to be quoted. The official Roman Catholic answer in this country was that these papal pronouncements had to do with the ideal state, and had no reference to conditions in a country like America. But there remained, as there still remains, the conviction in the minds of many Protestants, that Alfred E. Smith was personally going beyond the age-old attitude of his church in his advocacy of tolerance.

"What would happen to other religious faiths, if and when Roman Catholicism came into power in the United States to such an extent as to be able to change the first amendment to the Constitution? Miller, Ryan and Boland, in their approved work, *Catholic Principles of Politics* (1940), do not dodge that question. Protestantism, they say, would be allowed the private, restricted liberty of worship, but anything like public propaganda, or equality with Roman Catholicism would be out of the question. 'Since no rational end is promoted by the dissemination of false doctrine, there exists no right in this practice. . . . Error has not the same rights as truth.'

"Of course there is always the qualification that this is a theoretical situation, and that there is little or no prospect of its being actualized. But that is not good enough. Nobody talks about a theoretical situation without envisioning the possibility of its coming to pass. Regretfully one is forced to the conclusion that, on the basis of authoritative Roman Catholic teaching, tolerance has no basis.

"It may be claimed, and it may be granted as an expedient. This is clearly stated in the classic *Immortale Dei* of Leo XIII. But Protestants may never claim it as a right. More than a hundred years ago Louis Veuillot, a prominent French Ultramontanist, said, 'When you are in the majority, we claim tolerance from you on the basis of your principles; when we are in the majority, we deny tolerance to you on the basis of our principles.' That uncompromising declaration of the Roman Catholic view on tolerance is not an inaccurate summary of the official voice of that church. On that ground, Roman Catholics have no business consorting with us heretics, except that they may convert us. On that ground, they have nothing to learn from us except what not to do, what not to believe."

A.



**Brief Items.**—In St. Louis the Metropolitan Church Federation adopted this resolution: "In view of the evidence of the growing spirit of intolerance in various areas of American social and educational life, especially manifest in the renewed activities of such organizations as the Ku Klux Klan, the Metropolitan Church Federation of St. Louis urges on all Christians the necessity of a firm and vigorous opposition to all such movements. Such movements being contrary to the spirit of Christianity and democracy, we affirm that no Christian can have a part in any organization that appeals to a spirit of hatred and prejudice."

According to the *Lutheran* of July 10, Dr. Carl C. Rasmussen of Gettysburg Seminary left on June 28 for Europe to spend four months on that continent. The time will be given to "a study of the current theological literature of the European countries. He will confer with authors and publishers regarding books deserving translation into English." Wartburg Theological Seminary at Dubuque is granting a year's leave of absence to Dr. Charles Bodensieck, its president. His mission is "to help maintain relations between the churches over there and over here."

Dr. Horace Ford Martin has resigned as president of Biblical Seminary, New York, because he reached the retirement age. He is a member of the U. L. C. A. His successor will be Dr. John G. McKee, who has been connected with the seminary for the past twenty-one years. The school was founded in 1900 as a non-denominational seminary.

A transport plane seating 27 passengers has been purchased for the Lutheran World Convention by Daniel Nelson, the convention's China Relief Director. The plane will make regular trips from China to Calcutta to transport missionary personnel and to bring back medicines and supplies. It will connect in India with the plane from Europe operated by the Scandinavian missionary societies. — *Christian Century*.

London needs many new church buildings. A report says that if there is to be a church for every 10,000 persons living in London, 35 new buildings are required. During the war 624 of the 701 churches were damaged and 91 were completely destroyed.

A unique dinner was recently "held" in New York. Tickets were sold at \$20, \$15, \$10, and \$5 per plate. The interesting feature was that the dinner did not take place, that the guests participated *in absentia*, that the speakers served likewise *in absentia*, that the food was likewise conspicuous through *absentia*, and that the only thing which did not have this characteristic was the money, which was for European and Asiatic relief. Who would not like to serve as speaker on such an occasion? and what a pleasure to be a guest at a banquet of that kind! Long live *in absentia* of this nature.

**From Religious News Service.**—The Moravian Church in Czechoslovakia has voted to sever official relations with the denomination's headquarters in Herrenhut, Saxony, Germany, and has elected its own bishop and general assembly. Breaking of ties with German branches of their denominations is now being undertaken by all religious groups in Czechoslovakia, either voluntarily or under state compulsion.

A total of 109,705 elementary school children attended classes under a released-time program of the city of New York during the past season, it was announced by Assistant Superintendent of Schools William Jansen. In a report to Dr. Walter M. Howlett, executive secretary of the Greater New York Co-ordinating Committee on Released-Time, Jansen pointed out that this figure was a drop of only 1,906 from last year. The elementary school register decreased by 15,000 pupils in the same period. The Borough of Brooklyn reported the largest attendance, 43,829.

Speaking before the Assembly of the Northern Presbyterians meeting in Atlantic City, Governor Edward Martin of Pennsylvania urged his hearers to help revive in members of all Christian churches a sense of unity in their beliefs and principles. "This unity," he said, "should be strong enough to brush aside the small differences which divide us and to release our power for the great fight that is upon us. We have peace today, but it is an uneasy peace, without brotherhood. It is a peace without the unity of purpose we reached in the battle against the Axis. There is only one institution on earth, only one force or belief, held by a sufficient number of men, powerful enough to fight the forces of disunity. That power is religion." It is well to urge striving for unity, but more important is the urging that loyalty to God and His truth be manifested.

25 archbishops and 102 bishops were appointed by Pope Pius XII to sees throughout the world at a secret consistory attended by 20 cardinals.

Nearly one fourth of the \$10,000,000 sought by Lutheran World Action for Overseas Relief and Spiritual Reconstruction has been raised in cash contributions in the first quarter of the two-year drive, it was reported by Dr. Paul C. Empie, national director of the appeal. According to Dr. Empie's report, the eight participating bodies of the National Lutheran Council and related sources in the last six months have turned in \$2,393,411.45, or 23.9 per cent of the total sought.

In Rome a priest, Father Pecoraro, who allegedly took part in a republican demonstration and afterwards headed a group of Communists on a march through Rome waving a red flag, was suspended. An ecclesiastical court is investigating charges against him. In the strongly Communist provinces of Emilia 20 priests have been slain by anti-clerical elements, according to a report from Rome.